

The Classical Review

JUNE 1909

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

DR. WARREN'S DEATH OF VIRGIL AND CLASSICAL STUDIES.

SOME critics may depreciate the literary merit of Dr. Warren's *Death of Virgil*: Walter Savage Landor would have esteemed it highly. But, independently of its merit as poetry, it comes very opportunely just now. For it is an object-lesson of the way in which Greek and Latin Classics must be studied, if they are to keep their place in education.

At this moment in England the air is rife with controversies about education, as if we were awakening to the fact, that the making of the character of the nation is more really momentous than questions of finance; and certainly of all educational questions this particular one is not the least in importance. The old struggle of the fifteenth century in Europe seems to recur in a new shape. Then the nascent literature of Hellas dethroned scholasticism. Now the 'culture, almost universal in its range, robust and vigorous though versatile and exquisite, which Europe inherits from the most artistic race that ever was,'¹ will be lost, unless the literature, which enshrines this Culture, can be studied in such a temper and in such a method as to be made interesting generally. It must be brought into familiar contact with the sympathies of life, as life is lived now. The

¹ All that is finest in Roman art and literature percolates from Greece. Southern Italy to this day is more Greek than Roman.

dead Past must live again before our eyes. The men and women of to-day must find their counterparts, in flesh and blood, (by the touch of nature, which 'makes the world akin,') limned by the unfaltering hand of men, who drank their inspiration from the pellucid skies, the soft airs, the 'old poetic mountains' of Attica. This is what Dr. Warren has done for us in his *Death of Virgil*.

Poetry cannot be transliterated from one language to another. The spirit may be transfused, but not the letter. Swift's lines

'Harley, the nation's great support,
Returning home one day from court,
Espied a parson near Whitehall
Cheapening old authors at a stall, etc.,

are more truly Horace, and Johnson's

'All sciences a fasting Mounseer knows,
And, bid him go to Hell, to Hell he goes—'

is more truly Juvenal's

'omnia novit
'Graeculus escuriens; ad coelum jussus, ibit'

than the most rigidly exact rendering could be.

The author rightly calls his *Death of Virgil* a 'dramatic narrative,' not a 'drama.' It is more akin to *Comus* or *Samson Agonistes* than to the ordinary stage-play. Action there is hardly any. Yet the interest never flags. The picture of Virgil, as he lay, fever-stricken,

at what is now Brindisi, is life-like; the Tennysonian flow of the blank verse, most difficult though easiest of metres, is graceful and musical; the tone, the sentiment rings true. The reader sees it all and feels it all—the sick-room, the friends standing by, the dying poet himself.

Both as man and poet Virgil is here portrayed justly. Conington put Virgil and Scott together.¹ Both had the same passion for country-life and folk-lore, the same fondness for stringing a sonorous list of place-names together, the same patriotic ardour. Both sing of feats of arms. Here the difference comes in. To the one Marmion's last charge on Flodden Field or the bold moss-trooper

‘on his border foray
Pattering an Ave Mary’

was a joy; to the other all this sort of thing was perfunctory, to please his friend and patron, the Caesar. ‘Let me love streams and woods and I am content without fame.’ If, as Dr. Warren paints him, he was hypercritical about his *Aeneid*, morbidly anxious to add a finishing touch to what was already polished enough, his sensitiveness was for love of his art mainly. He was singularly unambitious, unsordid, unselfish, a ‘white soul,’ as his friend Horace said; and this sheer unworldliness made him, like ‘Noll’ Goldsmith, all the more lovable. This fastidious scrupulosity of the dying poet, though it detracts somewhat from the greatness of the man, makes the whole scene more truly human. It might be Tennyson revising an Idyll again and again in the presence of the Prince Consort and Gladstone.

Even a reader who has never heard of the *Aeneid* realises, how true to nature it all is. The dry bones are scarfed again with flesh and nerve and sinew; the hopes and fears of to-day pulsate in the men of 1900 years ago. One might be reading of Alexander Pope, sick at an inn in Southampton with Bolingbroke near his pillow.

¹ Dr. Arnold at Rugby used to compare Virgil's ‘*Audiit et Triviae longè lacus*’ with the convent bell in *Marmion*.

The stately Romans in their tunics and togas, how modern they become! Horace, for instance,

‘that friend of friends,
The little, plump, shrewd, dapper poet-critic;
The laughing, loving, lyric-satirist,
Of wit and heart, honey and gall compounded’

may be found easily, if one looks for him, at a club in Pall-Mall. The faithful Eros is the literary man's typewriter in this twentieth century. Virgil is ‘poet-laureate.’ He and Horace in their early days were ‘treasury-clerk and briefless barrister.’ The comic incidents of their journey to Brundisium are the ‘clown and pantaloons’ of our Drury Lane. Time and distance are annihilated. Men, women and children all the world over, their almost infinite diversity of idiosyncrasies notwithstanding, are strangely like one another after all.

It is an anachronism to introduce microbes into Virgil's reminiscences of the graveyard at Megara. But the thought is quite in keeping with the environment, when Augustus, anticipating the future glory of his friend, imagines

‘Kings in the crisis of their fortune's fate’

endeavouring, like our Charles I., to find an omen in the ‘Sortes Virgilianae,’ or some famous poet in the far-away British Isles treading in Virgil's footsteps, like our Tennyson, with King Arthur in place of ‘pius Aeneas.’

Many other things, as well as largeness and thoroughness of culture, have to be thrown into the scales when we poise the ‘pros and cons,’ the loss and gain, the advantages and disadvantages of retaining the study of Greek and Latin. To learn these languages is an ‘Open Sesame’ to the romance languages of modern Europe, as well as to the technical language of modern science. What is more vital still, merely as gymnastic, no substitute for this study has yet been found in the way of developing the faculty of observation. Call the niceties of Greek philology, if you will, a mere drill, a treadmill. Even so they have their use. The first thing in learning is ‘to learn how to learn.’ All this, and much besides, will have to go, unless people can be brought to see that

those, who taught and wrote centuries ago, are in close touch with life nowadays. This is what the *Death of Virgil* helps one to realise. It shows vividly the humanising influence of what has been rightly called 'litterae humaniores.' We talk of 'the dead languages.' They are not 'dead.' The teaching of them must be un-pedantic. Too much stress in days past may have been laid on particles and accents. The danger now is of exaggerating the value of the exhumation of paraphernalia, which are merely accessories to the great drama of Life.

The study of Latin and Greek, except for professed students, must be compressed into fewer years by the use of such schoolbooks as Thackeray's *Analecta*. And the purities must be got rid of, which are a blot on what is otherwise supremely beautiful. The time for learning is limited; year by year the struggle for existence grows keener; and, deplore it as one may, with too many what is immediate counts for more than what seems far away.

I. GREGORY SMITH.

Horsell, Woking, 1909.

THREE FRAGMENTS OF SAPPHO.

WHEN Herculaneum gives up its treasures we may confidently hope that Sappho's poems will be among them. Meanwhile we owe it to the greatest poetess of the world to make the very best we can of the few fragments of her works that have been recovered in recent times. In all of these torn pieces of papyrus or vellum there is something to be supplied, before, even as fragments, they can be in any sense complete. Often the beginnings of all the lines are torn away, or there is an internal gap to be bridged by conjecture, or the loss of a line at the top or bottom of the page suggests to the reader's mind a lovely sculptured head that has come down to us lacking nose or chin. The proper limits of restoration are, of course, a matter of personal taste. No one would add a new body to the Castellani Head of Aphrodite; but while some would leave the Hermes of Praxiteles with no legs and but one foot, many would prefer him with both legs and both feet. In dealing with these fragments of Sappho's work I have allied myself with the latter school. In two places where the context gives a clue I have not hesitated to 'restore' a whole line, in the hope that in meaning, at any rate, the words come near to what Sappho wrote. Where there are gaps, external or internal, I have tested all suggestions by tracing letters and letter-groups from the extant portions, and in the case of lines lacking their beginning

have sought to make the proposed additions correspond in written length. In the first fragment the length of the internal gaps is itself doubtful. The only means of arriving at an accurate estimate here was to reconstruct the MS in such a way as to correct all twists, rents, and creases of the vellum. This I have done by making tracings of certain portions separately and then piecing them together.

These tests have overthrown many of the earlier suggestions, and while I cannot claim certainty for those I have substituted for them, I feel sure that in most cases we now have the choice of but two or perhaps three possible alternatives.

The first two fragments were first published by Dr. W. Schubart in *Sitzungsberichte d. Königl. Preuss. Akad. d. Wissenschaften*, 1902, i. p. 195, with a facsimile, and have been re-edited in *Berliner Klassikertexte*, v. 2 (1907), where a bibliography will be found. They are written side by side on a piece of vellum which, folded down the middle, formed two not necessarily consecutive leaves of a book. The writing dates from about the 7th century. The first contains a large gap, where however two or perhaps three lines can be restored from extant quotations. Of the second only the beginning of the first stanza, a few letters of the second, and the last word of the last, have been torn away. In both cases I have worked upon new

photographs kindly supplied me by Dr. Schubart. They are a good deal clearer than the facsimile in the *Sitzungsberichte*.

I. In the Ode to the Nereids Sappho seeks to make up a quarrel with her brother. The motive of the present fragment would seem to be similar. In *Fr.* 41¹ Sappho complains that her pupil Atthis has left her for a rival teacher: 'Atthis, it became hateful to thee to think of me, and now thou flutterest after Andromeda.' In *Fr.* 33 she is probably harping on the same string: 'I loved thee once, Atthis, long ago.' Neither of these fragments can belong here. Not only is the metre different, but the subject of this piece is in the third person. On the other hand this poem may well have had the same motive, and the use of the third person in such a case is paralleled by the Ode to the Nereids. We need but one line to complete a stanza, which, considering the length and unity of what follows, may well have been the first. The relative α below makes a feminine third-person subject necessary; θέλω calls for μοι, ἔμεθεν, or με. I choose the name Atthis for the parallel with the two fragments above. For the crasis μοι οὐκ, cf. μὴ ἀλλὰ below, ὠράνω αἰθερος *Ode* 1, and κείσεαι οὐδέποτα, *Fr.* 68. If I have rightly interpreted the scanty traces of this line, crasis is unavoidable. Sappho and Alcaeus elsewhere use the form ἦλθον, *Sa.* 1. 8, *Alc.* 84, but Sappho sometimes uses Epic forms for metrical reasons, cf. ἀνήτοιο 78. 2.

Text:

[Ἀτθίς μοι οὐκ ἄ]ρ['] ἀνήλυθε]ν,
 τεθνάκην δ' ἀδόλως θέλω.
 ἃ με ψισδομένα κατελίπτανεν
 πόλλα, καὶ τόδ' ἔειπ[έ μοι]
 5 Ὀμι', ὡς δαίνα πεπ[όνθ]αμεν,
 Ψάπφ'· ἦ μάν σ' ἀέκοισ' ἀπυλιππάνω.
 τὰν δ' ἔγω τάδ' ἀμειβόμαν·
 Χαίροις' ἔρχεο κἄμεθεν
 μέμναι· Φοῖσθα γὰρ ὡς σε πεδήπομεν.
 10 αἱ δὲ μὴ, ἀλλά σ' ἔγω θέλω
 ὀμναισαι τ[ὰ σ]ῇ [λα]θεαι,
 ὅσσ' [ἀμμες φίλα] καὶ κάλ' ἐπάσχομεν·

¹ Beigk⁴.

πόλλοις ἃ στεφάν]οις ἔων
 καὶ βρ[όδων γλυ]κίων γ' ἔμοι
 15 κὰπ π[λόκων] παρ ἔμοι περεθήκαο,

καὶ πόλλαις ἵπα]θύμυδας
 πλέκ[ταις ἀμφ'] ἀπάλαι δέραι
 ἀνθέων ἐκ[ατον] πεπονημέναις,

καὶ πόλλωι ν[έαρ]ο]ν σὺν χρωῶ
 20 βρενθείω πρ[οχ]οῶι μύρ]ω
 ἐξαλείψαο κα[ὶ] βασιληῖω;

καὶ στρώμ[ας ἐπ]ι κημένα
 ἀπάλαν παρ [ἐδ]ητύων
 ἐξίης πόθο]ν ἦδὲ πτότων γλύκιων.

25 κωῦτε τ . . . [.
 ἱρον οὐδ' ὕ[.
 ἔπλετ' ὄν τρ[.

οὐκ ἄλσος[.

Critical Notes:

[The signs +, =, - indicate that a suggestion exceeds, coincides with, or falls short of, the gap in the MS.] 1/2 My suggestions fit the following scanty indications:—between the tops of δ and ο in ἀδολως a slanting stroke which must be the tail of ρ, φ, or ψ: above and some way to the right of ω in θέλω (sic) the bottom right-hand corner of ν: MS clearly δ'αδολως (not as S.). 3 MS ψισ'δομενα 4 MS τοδ' 5 MS ωμ' 6 MS ψαπφ' and σ': MS απυλιππανω 7 MS τανδ': MS ταδ'αμειβομ'αν 8 MS χαιροις' 9 MS μεμναισθ'οισθα, the first θ has apparently been corrected to F: Wil. μέμναισσο ισθα: Solmsen μέμνα Φοῖσθα: MS ωσε-πεδ'ηπομεν, for haplography cf. next frag. l. 6 10 MS σ' 11 S. [σὺ δε] λ[α]θεαι, but the tops of τ and υ are nearly certain 12 after οσσ the tops of what may be αμ: MS prob. φίλια: Jurenka δσσα τέρπνα τε-: MS καλ' 13 S. πόλλοις γὰρ +: MS ἔων 14 γλυκίων Fraccaroli, but κ may be χ: of Blass' α before this letter the traces are very doubtful: it is just possible that γ' may be τ' (B.), but cf. εγω l. 7 and νωνγ'απ next frag. l. 20: ὅμοι B. 15 περεθηκαο J. MS παρεθηκας 16/17 = *Fr.* 46: the letter after the gap in 16 is not θ, prob. δ 17 MS απαλαδεραι, the 3rd α being a correction of ι 18 Wil. ελαρινων+ 19 MS πολλω 20 MS βρενθείω: MS prob. προχωω, the tail of ρ is clear: the last letter of the line appears as ωι in the MS; for carelessness about ι adscript cf. απαλα l. 17, πολλω l. 19, and next frag. ll. 18 and 20: S. βασιληῖω- 21 MS εξαλειψαο 23 MS παν οι παμ (not παρ) 24 MS ποθε or ποθο 26 MS ἱρον 27 MS επλετ' In this and the next fragment the stanzas are generally separated by short horizontal strokes placed above the first letter of the new stanza and projecting into the margin.

Translation:

So my Atthis is not come back, and in sooth I would I were dead. And yet she wept full sore to leave me behind, and said, 'Alas! how sad our lot, Sappho; I swear 'tis all against my will I leave thee.' To her I answered, 'Go thy way rejoicing and remember me; for thou knowest how I doted upon thee. And if thou rememberest not, O then I am fain to remind thee of what thou forgettest, how dear and beautiful was the life we led together. For with many a garland of violets and sweet roses mingled thou hast decked thy flowing locks by my side, and with many a woven necklet made of a hundred blossoms thy dainty throat; and with many a jar of myrrh both of the precious and the royal hast thou anointed thy fair young skin before me, and lying upon the couch hast taken thy fill of dainty meats and of sweet drinks. . . .'

Commentary:

3. ψισδομένα: cf. Hes. ψίζομένη κλαύουσα (S.). κατελιπανεν: so the MS; this may be right; σ^m becomes $\pi\pi$ in $\delta\pi\pi\alpha = \delta\mu\mu\alpha$, and it is possible that $\eta\gamma^m$ also became $\pi\pi$, cf. κύββα ap. Hes. = κύμβη and ἀππασόμενος for ἀναπασόμενος in Boeotian, the new Corinna *Asop.* 78; or the form might correspond to an imaginary Attic λειπάνω, cf. κενθάνω, and for ι εξαλίσσω l. 21.
9. μέμναι: I take this to be the imperative corresponding to an indicative μέμναιμαι; an alternative is to read μέμναισ' οἶσθα (μέμναισο = μέμνησο), regarding μεμναισθ' οἶσθα as a blunder and μεμναισθ' οἶσθα as an ignorant attempt to correct it. The infinitive μέμναισθ(αι) would be strange so soon after ἐρχεο.
11. θυναισαι: i.e. ἀναμνήσαι.
12. ἄμμες: for νῶ as generally in Lesbian.
- 13 ff. I take ἄ . . . γε together 'seeing that thou'; the repeated πολλοῖς . . . πολλοῖς . . . πολλοῖς refer of course to the frequency of these delightful scenes, not to the number of the wreaths, etc., on any one occasion.
14. γλυκίων: i.e. γλυκίων, cf. Meist.-Ahr. i. p. 48; there seems to be no flower-name which could follow βρώδων here; this makes τ' impossible unless we read καὶ for κατ in l. 15 and another epithet instead of πλόκων. There are no words for 'red' and 'white' that will fit; besides, the scent is the point, not the colour. θμοι: i.e. ὁμοῖ.
15. κατ πλόκων: πλόκος is so used in the compound ὑπλόκος by Alcaeus *Fr.* 55; κατὰ suits long hair; the phrase is contrasted with ἀμφ' ἀπάλα δέραι below.
18. ἀνθέων ἔκατον: an epithet would be out of place here; to speak of flowers in general after τα and βρόδα above, would seem strange unless they are mentioned for their number. πεπονημέναις: perhaps a late blunder on the false analogy of σελάννα etc.; but the 'false' extension may also have been made in Sappho's time; the MSS read κάλημι l. 16, φιλῆμι *Fr.* 79, νόημα *Fr.* 14 and on an inscription we find προαγρημένω, cf. Meist.-Ahr. i. p. 148.
- 20/21. In his note on *Fr.* 49 Bergk quotes Athenaeus 15. 690 E Σαπφὼ δὲ ὁμοῦ μέμνηται τοῦ τε βασιλείου καὶ τοῦ βρενθείου, λέγουσα οὕτως: βρενθείω βασιλῆϊ. If this was the place, Athenaeus must have been quoting from memory. Though the two words would scan here side by side, the MS reads βρενθείω followed by an obscure letter and then ρ, and moreover βασιλῆϊ would be a good deal too short for the gap.
- 23/24. πάν: short in Aeolic, see Meist.-Ahr. i. p. 36; I take it here as accusative masculine, cf. Alc. ap. Choer. Dict. 95. 12 (Bggk. 48a) Αἴαν = Αἴαντα, and λυκάβαν = λυκάβαντα *C.I.G.* 2169 (M.-A. i. p. 158); so too in LXX. πάν . . . ἐξῆς πόθον: either (1) 'didst put forth all thy desire,' i.e. eat without restraint, or (2) like the Homeric ἐξ ἔρον ἐντο 'didst put away all thy desire,' i.e. eat thy fill. The active occurs in the latter sense *Il.* 24. 227 ἐπὶ γόου ἐξ ἔρον εἶην. γλυκίων: disyllabic, cf. χρυσοῖσιν *Fr.* 85. ἐδῆτύον: or perhaps ἐδωδάων; Sappho is said to have used the form Μοισάων, *Fr.* 164.

The following restoration of ll. 23, 24 I think more fanciful and less likely:

ἀπάλαν παγ [ἐρον φρέων
ἐξῆς ποθέσσαις] ἐτάρας τέας,

'hast sent forth all the love of thy tender heart in desire of thy friend.' With ἐτάρας τέας cf. *Frag.* 83 δαύοις ἀπάλας ἐτάρας | ἐν στήθεσιν. Blass suggested καὶ στρώμας ἀπὸ μαλθάκας | ἀπάλαν παρ' ἐμοι χέρα | ἐξῆς ποθέσσαις πότον γλόκυ. But παρ' is a misreading of the MS and χέρα is unlikely for χέρρα, cf. M.-A. i. p. 147 and Alc. new *frag.* C.R. May.

II. This poem, though ostensibly addressed to a pupil who was still with Sappho, was doubtless intended to be sent to another pupil who had taken up her abode across the sea. If I am right in supposing only one line to be lost at the beginning of the preceding fragment, there is perhaps some probability that only one is missing here. The two poems would then begin at equal distances from the upper edge of the original pages. The existing remains of this poem, like those of the other, seem to me in favour of this view. Of the first stanza we have

16 ff. *ζαφούταισ'*: i.e. *διαφουῶσα*, present participle of *ζαφούταιμι*, *nominativus pendens*; *ἐπιμνάσθεσα* is dependent on it.

ἀγῶνας: so the MS for *ἀγῶνας*; it may well be the Aeolic form, cf. *ὄνια*, *ὄν* for *ἀνά*.

ιμέρω: genitive with *δσᾶ*.

λέπταν: cf. Simon. 37. 14 *λεπτόν ὑπείχες οἶας*.

βόρηται: third person singular of a middle *μι*-verb *βόρημαι* corresponding to a form *βορέομαι* in Attic = *βιβρώσκω*, cf. *βορά*, *φορά*, *φορέω*.

If we keep *ποι*, several alternatives present themselves—all, to my mind, unsatisfactory: (1) take *ζαφούταισ'* as 3rd person singular, *ποι* as 'in what direction,' 'for whom,' introducing an indirect question loosely dependent on *ἐπιμνάσθεσα*, *ιμέρω* and *δσᾶ* as dative, and *βόρηται* = *βαρεῖται*, and translate 'and often our beloved wanders abroad calling to mind her gentle Atthis, (and wondering) for whom her tender breast is oppressed with longing (and) her heart with pain'; but *βόρηται* for *βαρεῖται* is hardly paralleled by *βρόχους* for *βραχούς*, for *ορ* in Aeolic represents *ερ* in Attic (cf. *ὀρκετον* Fr. 40)¹; moreover the omission of 'and' is almost if not quite impossible; and further, the point is not Atthis' love for an unknown person but the Sardis lady's love for Atthis, as the following lines show—besides, *νῦν* would be required; (2) take *ποι* as dative of a word equivalent to *τίς* agreeing first with *ιμέρω* and then with *δσᾶ*; this is open to the same objections; (3) read *ιμερος*, taking *ζαφούταισα* (and *ἐπιμνάσθεσα* dependent on it) as *nominativus pendens*, take *ποι* = *ποιεῖ* (cf. *χρῶν* for *χρῶ* or *χρῶ* Sa. 2. 10 and *Ode to the Nereids*, *ὄν* 'sheep' 95. 2, and Soph. *El.* 882 where it has been proposed to read *ροεῖ* as a monosyllable), *δσᾶ* as nominative and *βόρηται* = 'devours,' translating 'longing wastes her frame (and) pain preys upon her heart.' The omission of 'and' makes this very doubtful. Other possibilities involve the same or similar difficulties, e.g. *ποι* = *που* enclitic as Pindar *Pyth.* 5 et al. (so Wilam., and *βόρηται* = *βαρεῖται*), *πο* = *πρός* as in Doric.

19. *κῆθου*: I follow previous editors with some hesitation; if this form corresponds to Attic *ἐκείσε* with the *-υῖ* termination seen in *τυῖδε*, should we not expect *κῆσιν*, cf. *μέσση* for *μεσσήθι*? perhaps the *θ* appears by contamination with *κῆθι* = *ἐκείθι* and *κῆθεν* = *ἐκείθεν*. I should suggest as an alternative *κῆθῶν* = *καὶ εὐθύ* if it did not give a weak sense.

- 19 ff. *τὰ δὲ* 'and what she says,' *οὐ νῶν γ' ἄπυστα* 'not unknown to us' (predicate), *νύξ πολῶς* (= *πολύωτος*) 'Night with her many ears,' *γαρυεῖ δ' ἄλως* 'calls across the sea.' *νῶν*: the dual is unusual in Lesbian, but as it occurs sometimes in verbs (e.g. *καθέταν* Alc. 39. 5? *ποίητον* *El. M.* 23. 12, cf. Meist.-Ahr.

¹ *πτόμος* for *παρμός* is a possible exception, cf. Meist.-Ahr. i. p. 49.

pp. 178, 188) and the form *νῶς* is found in Boeotian, Cor. 5, there is no reason to reject it. *γαρυεῖ*: for the form see Meist.-Ahr. p. 181.

παρενρεόσας: our choice seems to lie between words meaning 'silent,' 'dark,' or 'flowing between'; cf. *παρεμβάλλω*, *παρεμπίπτω*, *παρένθεσις*. As an alternative avoiding the unsupported compound I would suggest *περιρρεόσας*, 'flowing around,' implying that Lesbos is an island and so emphasising the impossibility of the friends' meeting.

III. The third fragment was discovered in 1879. It is included among the Adespota in Bergk's posthumous edition, but Blass ascribed it to Sappho, and metre and style alike are in favour of this view. It is re-edited in the *Berliner Klassikertexte* v. I have used the excellent facsimile in Wharton's *Sappho* (1895). The fragment is part of a vellum page, both sides of which contained poems in the Sapphic metre, but only one of the two is sufficiently preserved to warrant an attempt at restoration. The writing on both sides is by the same hand, the letters small and neat, suggesting that there were horizontal lines ruled for each line of the text and a vertical line on the left to secure an even margin. That the former were at right angles to the latter, becomes evident if we place tracings of the two sides back to back, when the lines on one side are seen to be parallel to those on the other. In the following attempt the beginnings of the lines all coincide with a vertical line drawn at right angles to the text, and for that reason may be regarded as coming nearer than the ends to what Sappho wrote.

The occasion of the poem I take to be a quarrel between Sappho and one of her brothers, probably Charaxus. Of the three brothers mentioned by Suidas one is known only from that passage, and another, Larichus, is known to have been a great favourite with her. The third is Charaxus, of whom she wrote in the *Ode to the Nereids*. The drift of the passage does not perhaps justify us in supposing that this is the poem in which we are told by Herodotus that she *πολλὰ ἐκερτόμησέ μιν* when he returned from Nau-cratis with the ransomed Rhodopis. We feel that in that poem she must have spoken more directly. But there is to my mind an elder-sisterly ring in this fragment which

makes it probable that it was addressed to Charaxus on an earlier occasion. That Sappho was older than Charaxus is very probable. She was old enough and important enough to be included among the nobles who were banished from Lesbos in 596. Suidas' date for her birth, Ol. 42 (612—), is therefore probably too late. She must have written the *Ode to the Nereids* at least a year or so after 570; for it was in that year that Egypt, under Amasis, was thrown open to Greek trade, and, moreover, Herodotus says, 2. 134, κατ' Ἀμασιν βασιλεύοντα ἦν ἀκμάζουσα Ῥοδόπις. Sappho must then have been at least 50 in 568, but it is extremely unlikely that the wayward Charaxus was as old at that date. We find the same dignified and yet straightforward tone of remonstrance in her answer to Alcaeus (*Fr.* 28) αἰ δ' ἦχες ἕσλον ἔμερον ἢ κάλων κ.τ.λ. But here there is something else as well, the idea of a family honour to be upheld, an idea which occurs again, if I am not mistaken, in the *Ode to the Nereids*— γένειτο δ' ἄμμι | δίσκλεα μῆδεις.

Text:

- . . .] δώσῃν.
 τῷ κλέτῳ μὲν τ' ἐπ[ότει πεδ' ἀνδρῶν
 κῶν κ[άλων κᾶλων, ἐ[νέπει δὲ χαίρην
 τοῖς φί]λοις, λίπης τέ μ[ε σοὶ γένεσθαι
 5 φαῖς ἐ]μ' ὄνειδος, ἦπαρ] οἰδήσεις. ἐπὶ τᾷ[ιδε δ' ὕβρει
 καρδι]αν ἄσαιο τὸ γὰρ ν[όημα
 τῶ]μον οὐκ οὔτω μ[αλάκως χόλαι παί-
 δων] διάκηται.
 10 ὄρπε,] μῆδ' [.

Critical Notes:

1 Bergk δοκίμοις χάριν μοι | οὐκ ἀπυδῶσιν + and the open vowels in μοι οὐκ make it very doubtful
 2 κλέτων Bl., ἰώνων is also possible: over τ in μεντ a zigzag mark: Buecheler συμφύτων μὲντ' ἐπατόνοισ
 λύραισι: Bgk. ἐπερίγῃς 3 κάλων Bl.: Bue. καὶ

κάλων κᾶλων ἐπών ἀπέλλης — 4 τοῖς φίλοις Bue.: MS λύπηστέμ (not λύπηστέμ): Bl. με κάπορίπτης 5 Bl. εἰς ἐμ' ὄνειδος. — and ὄνειδος seems not to be used so in the singular 6 Bgk. ἦ κὲν οἰδήσεις, ἐπὶ τ' αἰγ' ἀμέλγων=: Bl. ὦ κὲν οἰδήσεις, ἐπὶ τῷ τε λῶβαι=: Bue. θῦμον οὐ δῆσεις+: MS ἐπιτ 7 καρδιαν Bl.: Bgk. Σκυρίαν=: MS 'αν'άσαιο or 'ανόσαιο: MS τῶγαρ: νόημα Bl. 8/9 MS prob. τοῦμον: τῶμον Bl.: MS οὐκ: μαλάκως Bue.: Bgk. μαλάκοφρον ἐχθρῶς | τοῖς διάκηται (subjunctive) —: Bue. πρὸς ὄργαν | τὰν διάκηται (indicative) — 10 MS μῆδ' (not μῆδ) [The MS contains accents, stops, and marks of elision and crasis.]

Translation:

. . . Therefore not only dost thou hover about the notable rather than the good and noble, and biddest thy friends go about their business, but dost grieve me by saying in thy swelling pride that I am become a reproach to thee. Go to, glut thy heart with this thy insolence; for, as for me, my mind is not so softly disposed towards the anger of a child. Go thy way, nor . . .

Commentary:

2. ἐπ[ότει: the simple verb occurs Alc. *Fr.* 43 ποτόνται, and Sa. *Fr.* 41 ἐπ' Ἀνδρομέδαν πότη. The uncontracted form here is no difficulty. It was obviously a matter of metrical convenience. Sappho uses both ἄλλω (*Fr.* 69) and ἀέλω (*Fr.* 79 and above), both ἴσος (2. 1) and ἴσος (*Fr.* 91), both ὥρανος and ὄρανος (see above). λάθειαι, l. 9 of our first fragment, would be a good parallel if it were certain. For ἐπ. cf. ἄπ πατέρων Alc. *Fr.* 104, and *Fr.* 19. 3, where ἐββᾶ is read by some for ἐμβᾶ. For the phrase cf. Sa. *Fr.* 68. 3:

ἀλλ' ἀφάνης κῆν Ἀῖδα δόμοις
 φοιτάσεις πεδ' ἀμαύρων νεκῶν ἐκπεποταμένα,
 where the accepted ἐκπεποταμένα is meaningless.

4. λίπης: 2nd person of λῖπημι.
 5/6. φαῖς . . . οἰδήσεις: participles.
 7. νόημα: cf. *Fr.* 14.
 8. παίδων: two syllables as *Fr.* 95.
 10. ὄρπε: i.e. ἔρπε, cf. ὄρπετον *Fr.* 40.

J. M. EDMONDS.

ON τε ETC., WITH VOCATIVES.

MONRO writes in his *Homeric Grammar*, § 164, as follows: 'Regarding the use of the Vocative in Homer, the chief point to be noticed is the curious one (common to Greek and Sanscrit) that when two persons are addressed, connected by τε, the second name is put in the Nominative (Delbrück, *Synt. Forsch.* iv. p. 28).' Cf. Thompson's *Greek Grammar*, § 152.

This rule is also observed by the Attic dramatists. I will set forth the instances known to me, without any pretension to making anything like a complete list.

I. Certain instances. Aesch. *Septem.* 70, 'Αρά τ' Ἐρινὺς πατὴρ δὲ μεγασθενής: 121, Πάλλας, ὃ θ' ἵππιος ποντομέδων ἄναξ: *Ag.* 508, νῦν χαίρε μὲν χθὼν χαίρε δ' ἡλίον φάος, ἵππατος τε χώρας Ζεὺς ὁ Πύθιος τ' ἄναξ: *Soph. O.T.* 1398, ὃ τρεῖς κέλευθοι καὶ κεκρυμμένη νάπη δρυμός τε: *Ajax*, 862, ποταμοὶ θ' οἶδε: *Aristoph. Clouds*, 264, ὃ δέσποτ' ἄναξ λαμπρός τ' Αἰθέρ: 595, Φοῖβ' ἄναξ . . . ἢ τ' ἐπιχώριος ἡμετέρα θεός, αἰγίδος ἡνίοχος, πολιούχος Ἀθάνα: *Eur. Hipp.* 1128, ὃ ψάμαθοι πολυήτιδος ἀκτᾶς δρυμός τε¹: *H.F.* 1389, ὃ γαῖα Κάδμον πᾶς τε Θηβαῖος Λεῶς: *Iph. Aul.* 1136, ὃ πότνια μοῖρα καὶ τύχη δαίμων τ' ἐμός: *Phoen.* 1225, ὃ γῆς Ἑλλάδος στρατηλάται Κάδμον τε Λαός. It is true that in nearly all these passages the first name or noun might be called a nominative, but no one would naturally suppose them to be anything but vocatives, nor is the rule affected even if they were nominatives. At *P.V.* 88 Aeschylus certainly begins with a nominative, ὃ δῖος αἰθέρ . . . παμμήτωρ τε γῆ (παμμήτωρ *Med.*, παμμήτωρ *cet.*; the editors hesitate between the two, but it is clear that the Medicean is right). In two passages, Aesch. *Suppl.* 23, ὃ πόλις, ὃ γῆ ἵππατοί τε θεοὶ καὶ Ζεὺς Σωτήρ τρίτος: *Soph. Phil.* 1453, χαῖρ' ὃ μέλαθρον Νύμφαι τε καὶ κτύπος, we are to regard θεοὶ and Νύμφαι as already nominatives, Ζεὺς and κτύπος simply continuing the construction; otherwise indeed Ζεὺς and κτύπος would be strange.

II. Passages easily corrigible. Aesch. *Pers.* 629, Ἰῆ τε καὶ Ἑρμῇ βασιλεῦ τ' ἐνέριον, read βασιλεὺς: *Eur. Hipp.* 1165, ὃ θεοὶ Πόσειδόν τε, read Ποσειδῶν.

¹ 'So the Aldine, rightly as I think.'

III. Violations of the rule. In the dramatists I am aware of but one exception, *Eur. Frag.* 781, line 55 (Nauck), σὺ δ' ὃ πυρὸς δέσποινα, Δήμητρος κόρη, Ἥφαιστέ τε, and here the reading is not certain, though it is difficult indeed to see what else can be read. But the rule appears to have been too subtle for the Boeotian wit; Pindar, *Ol.* xiv. 13, ὃ πότνι' Ἀγλαῖα φιλοσίμολπέ τ' Εὐφροσύνη Θάλια τε ἐρασιμόλπε: *Pyth.* xi. 1, Σεμέλα μὲν ἀγνῆτις (-τι?) Ἴνώ τε ὁμοθάλαμε. It is observed in *frag. adesp.* 140 (Bergk), Κλωθὴ Λάχεσις τε.

If two adjectives are connected by τε, the second remains in the vocative. *Ar. Thesm.* 315, Ζεῦ μεγαλόνυμε χρυσιόλιγα τε: *Knights*, 561, ὃ Γεραίστιε παῖ Κρόνου Φορμίωνί τε φίλτατε. *Soph. Phil.* 1445, ὃ φθέγμα ποθεινὸν ἐμοὶ πέμψας χρόνιος τε φανεῖς is evidently no exception to this, though χρόνιος would also be possible; cf. *Eur. Tro.* 1221, σὺ τ' ὃ ποτ' οὔσα μῆτερ.

If the second person addressed be introduced by the words σὺ τε, we of course continue with a vocative, though apparently σὺ itself is to be regarded as nominative; e.g. *Ar. Clouds*, 359; *Thesm.* 322; *Eur. Tro.* 1221, 1269; *Helen*, 1097. At Aesch. *Septem*, 124, σὺ τ' Ἀρης, one would expect Ἄρες, but it may well enough be a poetical variation.

Armed with this information let us now turn back to Homer. Leaf on *Γ* 276 expresses himself with much doubt about the rule, inclining to think that the change in that passage from Ζεῦ πάτερ to Ἡελίός τε may after all be decided by the scansion. After contemplating the evidence from later poets, I hardly think it is possible to hesitate any longer. If we confine our view to Homer we may indeed well agree with Leaf, for this seems to be the only instance where the MSS. present a certain nominative with τε, whereas in four places they give the vocative. *P* 669, Μηριόνη τε, read Μηριόνης: *Ψ* 493, Αἴαν Ἰδομενεῦ τε, Αἴας Ἰδομενεὺς τε, Cobet, *metri gratia*: *τ* 406, γαμβρὸς ἐμὸς θυγάτηρ τε, θυγάτηρ, Monro: and finally *Θ* 185, Ξάνθε τε καὶ σὺ Πόδαργε καὶ Αἴθων Λάμπε τε δῖε, an atrocious line, which puts at once

dubious grammar into Hector's mouth and four horses into his chariot. However, no doubt it is quite ancient enough, and if Pindar was content with that construction, 'what shall hinder' the author of the Homeric line or passage in question 'from being as pliable as Pindar'? But I feel convinced that the genuine Homeric grammar requires a nominative.

Unfortunately in the great majority of instances the nominative and vocative are indistinguishable; *Ζεῦ ἄλλοι τε θεοὶ* and endless other such phrases would, however, clearly be felt by at any rate most of the classical poets as a vocative followed by a nominative.

I believe that *τε* is never used to connect two persons addressed in prose; the particle is always *καί*. At what date the sense of the correct idiom with *τε* was lost by the poets it were vain to speculate, but certainly by the time of the forgery of the prelude to the so-called Orphic Hymns it was completely ignored. I hope the present headmaster of Shrewsbury will graciously accept the emendation *εὐγενὴς τε παῖς* for *εὐγενές τε παῖ* in the first line of his Porson prize verses for 1861.

In his note on τ 406, Monro seems to attempt an explanation of the peculiarity by saying: 'So in Sanscrit, and doubtless in the original language, the voc. cannot be *part* of a sentence in any respect.' I confess I cannot understand this; does he mean that in *Ζεῦ, δὸς* the vocative stands outside the sentence, whereas in *Ζεῦ ἄλλοι τε θεοί, δότε*, the words *ἄλλοι τε θεοί* are somehow part of the sentence? Will not *Ζεῦ καὶ θεοὶ* then come under the same head? But, as I will shew directly, *Ζεῦ καὶ θεοὶ* would both be vocatives. The thing seems to me a mystery, and it may be wiser to be content with stating the facts. In the same note he also says: 'The voc. is never used with a conjunction such as *τε* or *δέ*.' This is loosely expressed, and must be taken to mean that when two persons or things are addressed, being connected by a conjunction such as *τε* or *δέ*, the second ought not to be in the vocative. For two adjectives in the vocative may be connected by *τε*, as we have seen, or by *δέ*, as *ὦ πολλὰ μὲν τάλαινα πολλὰ δ' αὖ*

σόφῃ γέναι (*Agam.* 1266), where I presume that no one will dream of asserting *σόφῃ* to be nominative. I do not make these remarks out of a desire to pick obvious holes in the work of a sagacious and admirable scholar to whom I owe so much, but rather because that note puzzled me and set me on pursuing the subject further to details perhaps trifling and even platitudinous; 'in tenui labor' truly.

The fact then is that two persons or things are never addressed in the same sentence by two nouns connected by *δέ*. And the reason is that *δέ* is too adversative in its nature. We may well say *ὦ τάλαινα μὲν σόφῃ δέ*, but who could think of saying *ὦ Πρίαμε Κασσάνδρα δέ*? Vocative nouns with *δέ* do, however, occur very rarely in a beautiful idiom of which I only know two instances, one the lovely line "*Υπν' ὀδύνας ἀδαῆς Υπνε δ' ἀλγέων*" (*Soph. Phil.* 827) and the other "*Ὀρία πότνα θεῶν Ὀρία δέ*" (*Eur. Bac.* 370). Of course, *Ἀτρεΐδα, σὺ δέ* and the like are plentiful, but there *δέ* always introduces a new sentence. We can however use such phrases as *ὦ φίλτατον μὲν ἡμαρ ἡδίστος δ' ἀνὴρ*, *Soph. Phil.* 530, for is not *ἡμαρ* here vocative? If so, the change to nom. with *δέ* is exactly like that with *τε*. Cf. *Eur. Med.* 1071.

When two vocatives are connected by *καί*, the common rule is that they remain vocative, and the second does not change to the nominative. Homer, *Z* 77, *Αἰνεία τε καὶ Ἑκτορ*, cf. *B* 371, etc.: *Soph. O.T.* 380, 1394: *Ar. Ach.* 55: *Wasps*, 136, 401, 433: *Thesm.* 320: *Plut.* 81: *Eur. Ion*, 465: *El.* 1177, frag. 938: Plato, *Gorg.* 458c: *Lach.* 180D, 186A: *Euthyd.* 274D; Lucian, *Timon*, 42. Therefore, in the ridiculous invocation of Aeschines, *Ctes.* § 260, *ὦ γῇ καὶ ἡλίε καὶ ἀρετῇ καὶ σύνεσις*, we must read *σύνεσι*. Pindar, *Ol.* xi. 3, *ὦ Μοῖσ'*, ἀλλὰ σὺ καὶ θυγάτηρ Ἀλάθεια Διὸς ἐρύκετον is not an exception, for σὺ καὶ θυγάτηρ ἐρύκετον would be impossible. Cf. Aesch., *Eum.* 775, *Eur. Ion*, 465, and καὶ Κίπρις ἄλεσσον at *Septem*, 127. *ὦ δίκαι καὶ θεῶν παλῖρρους πότμος* at *H.F.* 739 may be rather an exclamation in the nominative than a vocative.

ARTHUR PLATT.

THE RATE OF SAILING OF WAR-SHIPS IN THE FIFTH CENTURY B.C.

IN the article on the 'Fleet of Xerxes,' which Mr. W. W. Tarn contributed to the *Hellenic Journal* of November, 1908, speaking of the voyage of the Persian fleet from Therma to the Sepiad strand, he says: 'The fleet together moves from Therme to somewhere near C. Sepias in one day (7. 183), perhaps 120 miles. Dr. Grundy has defended this: but it seems a wild impossibility.' In a note attached to the passage Mr. Tarn says there is little real evidence of the pace of triremes: that single ship voyages afford no criterion, because the pace of the fleet is determined by that of its slowest member.

Mr. Tarn may disbelieve the ancient evidence; but he has made no attempt to prove its incorrectness. I do not profess to have a complete knowledge of that evidence, but it may be interesting to quote certain items relating to the Fifth Century which I have come across in the course of my reading.

Thucydides (ii. 97) says that a voyage from Abdera to the mouth of the Ister 'can be made by a merchant vessel, if the wind is favourable the whole way, at the quickest in four days and as many nights.'

The total distance for a vessel which kept in sight of land from the Bosphoros to the Ister would be 597 miles, of which over 50 would have to be made against the strong currents of the Hellespont and Bosphoros. Thucydides, himself a resident in the parts Thraceward, may be presumed to have known what he was talking about when he made this assertion. It will be seen that the rate of sailing works out at about 150 miles for the twenty-four hours, or $6\frac{1}{4}$ miles an hour; and this for a merchant vessel, a class of ship notoriously much slower than the warships of the same period.

Another noticeable point is that it is not assumed that a voyage of this length need be confined to the hours of daylight.

In iii. 3 Thucydides says that 'a messenger from Athens . . . crossed to Euboea and went on foot to Geraestos: there he found a merchant vessel just about to sail: he took ship, and arriving at Mytilene on the third day after he left Athens, announced the coming of the Athenian fleet.' Assuming that he took $2\frac{1}{2}$

days for the whole journey, the voyage from Geraestos to Mytilene cannot have occupied much more than one day, for by whatever route he went to Euboea his journey thither and the walk on foot to Geraestos can hardly have been accomplished in less than $1\frac{1}{2}$ days. If so, his sea journey works out at 6 miles an hour.

In iii. 49 Thucydides describes how a trireme sent with an urgent message to Mytilene all but overtook another trireme, which had 24 hours' start of it. He tells us that the first did not hurry on a disagreeable errand. Let us suppose that it travelled slower than a merchantman, and made only 5 miles an hour. The total distance from Piraeus to Mytilene is about 210 miles. The first trireme would, under this hypothesis, have taken 42 hours to accomplish the distance. The second trireme, therefore, cannot have taken much over 18 hours to accomplish the distance of 210 miles; that is to say, if we assume a very slow rate of progression for the first trireme.

In iv. 49 Thucydides says that the voyage from Thasos to Amphipolis is 'about half a day's sail.' Let it be conceded that he means the somewhat shorter distance to Eion. From the town of Thasos to Eion is about 50 miles. By half a day he means half of twelve hours, for when he includes a night in a calculation of distance he says so. The rate implied is therefore about $8\frac{1}{2}$ miles an hour. He is evidently speaking in general terms of the distance, not in terms of his own voyage. In this case, again, the length of time required would be well known to him from personal experience.

In vi. 1 Thucydides says that the voyage round Sicily for a merchant vessel is 'not much less than eight days.' Here again he says nothing of night-voyaging. The distance is about 510 miles. That works out at about 64 miles a day, or about $5\frac{1}{3}$ miles an hour, supposing always that the putting in at night and out in the morning were not included in the twelve hours a day.

I think that these statistics are sufficient to show that there is nothing 'wildly impossible' in the acceptance of Herodotus' statement

with regard to the voyage of the Persian fleet from Therma to the Sepiad strand. The actual statement made is as follows (Herodotus vii. 183): 'Sailing throughout a whole day they accomplished the voyage (from Therma) to Sepias in the Magnesian country and the shore which lies between the city of Kasthanaea and the Sepiad cape.' The statement is quite a general one. It would be gratuitous to assume that a critical reader must interpret it as meaning that the *whole* of the Persian fleet accomplished the whole distance within the daylight of a Greek summer's day.

What Herodotus is chiefly concerned with, and that which he obviously has in his mind is the fighting portion of the Persian fleet. But Mr. Tarn makes a curious mistake, which tends to upset his calculations. He says that the distance to be traversed was 'perhaps 120 miles.' How far a voyage of 'perhaps 120 miles' would have taken the Persian fleet I really cannot say, but one of an actual 120 miles in the direction in which it was going would have brought it into the North Euripus opposite to Artemision. But Herodotus says it went to the Sepiad strand, which he asserts to have been between Kasthanaea and Cape Sepias; and it is with Herodotus' assertion that Mr. Tarn is concerned. The site of Kasthanaea is uncertain.

It was probably near Meliboea. But if we concede somewhat, and assume that that part of the shore of Magnesia which, lying north of Cape Sepias and nearest to it, affords facilities for putting in, is the Sepiad strand of Herodotus, then the distance from Therma is 90, not 'perhaps 120' miles. It was of the utmost importance that the Persian fleet should get past the harbourless stretch of coast between Therma and the Euripus in as short a time as possible, the more so as it is a lee shore to the dangerous winds (N.E.) of the North Aegean. They could start in a fairly good light at 4 a.m. at the time of year. They would certainly not loiter by the way. Taking Thucydides' calculation of the rate of travel from Thasos to Amphipolis, which is over 8 miles an hour, the warships could have accomplished the distance in 11 hours, *i.e.* by 3 p.m. on the afternoon of the same day, whereas from the data also furnished by Thucydides the transports would have required from 15 to 18 hours to accomplish the distance.

I confess I do not understand where the 'wild impossibility' comes in, except in reference to the 'perhaps 120 miles' applied to an easily ascertainable distance of 90.

G. B. GRUNDY.

C.C.C., Oxford.

TERENCE, *ANDRIA* V. iv. 37-8 (940-1).

CH. At scrupulus mi etiam unus restat qui me male habet. PA. dignus es:

cum tua religione, odium, nodum in scirpo quaeris. CR. Quid istud est?

So Mr. Tyrrell's Oxford edition prints the text of this passage. The scholia recognize a v.l. *odio* for *odium*.

I submit that Pamphilus' sentence as it is given in the text is barely Latin, for the words *dignus es* are hardly capable of explanation; and that there are parallel passages in Terence which will lead us to an almost certain reconstruction of the corrupted idiom.

(1) *cum tua religione* is not classical Latin for *qua es religione*. Can it be justified by the idiom of comedy? I think not. See Appendix below.

(2) *dignus es*. The scholiast suggests *dignus es qui male habeatis* for an explanation. The nearest approach I can find in Terence is *Eun.* 1088.

GN. hunc comedendum vobis propino et deridendum. CH. placet.

PH. dignus est.

or *Adelph.* 919

di tibi, Demea,

bene faciant quom te video nostrae familiae tam ex animo factum velle. DE. dignos arbitror.

But, even allowing that Pamphilus means *dignus es qui male habeatis*, we are still left with no meaning for *cum tua religione*.

(3) Now a comparison of the following examples shews the legitimate and constant use of these *cum* phrases in Terence. They appear to correspond with a λαβὼν or συλλαβὼν in Greek, though I do not find an instance in the Menander fragments.

Ad. 713.

DEM. defessus sum ambulando: ut, Syre,
te *cum tua*

monstratione magnus perdat Iuppiter!

Hec. 134.

at te di deaeque faxint *cum isto odio*,
Laches! (faxint *Bentley*: perduint
codd.).

Phorm. 930.

in' hinc malam rem *cum istac magnificentia*!

Andr. 317.

abin' hinc in malam rem *cum suspicione*
istac, scelus!

The *cum* phrase belongs to imprecations; and an imprecation is just what Pamphilus' temper (look at the impatience in *odium*!) would otherwise make us expect.

And one more quotation from Terence gives us the very model for our reconstruction—*cum* phrase in imprecation, and use of *dignus*. It is *Eun.* 651.

PH. Quid festinas? aut quem quaeris,
Pythias?

PY. ehem, Phaedria, ego quem quaeram!
in' hinc quo digni's *cum donis tuis*
tam lepidis!

The conclusion hardly requires to be stated; the words *qui me male habet*, needless to the sense, are corrupt. In their stead Terence must have written something like

CH. At scrupulus mi etiam unus restat . . .

PA. in' malam rem, ubi dignus es
(or quo dignus es or ut dignus es)
cum tua religione, *odium*! *nodum in scirpo*
quaeris.

(For the omission of *in* with such phrases as *ire malam crucem*, one can instance both from Plautus and Terence: e.g. Ter. *Eun.* 536, *Phorm.* 368, Plaut. *Poen.* 496, *Men.* 328.)

I do not pretend that the emendation is verbally certain, only that the text can be restored upon an ascertained *type* of sentence: e.g. one might also read either of the alternatives above suggested: *ut* for *habet* (= *ht*) is palaeographically easy.

Then the exclamatory *odium* would be attached to the *nodum in scirpo* sentence.

APPENDIX.

M. Fabia in his admirable edition of *Eunuchus*, at l. 153,

Egon quicquam *cum istis factis* tibi respondeam?

makes *cum istis factis* 'equivalent to a causal proposition,' cites our *Andria* passage as another instance, and adds as illustrations:

Phorm. 465.

(i.) multimodis *cum istoc animo* es vituperandus.

(ii.) Plautus *Miles*.

Quid? Ego hic astabo tantioper *cum hac forma et factis* frustra?

(iii.) *Eun.* 353.

Quis is est tam potens *cum tanto munere* hoc?

Of these (iii.) is a true ablative of accompaniment, not qualification; and so no parallel.

(i.) needs only to be written *quom* *istoc animo* es, vituperandu's, and the anomaly disappears.

In (ii.) the Vetus Camerarii reads *quom* for *cum*; and, for *frustra*, *sit frustram*; another v.l. is *si sic frustram*. But here, too, even if the reading be sound, the meaning is 'beauty and exploits and all.'

These instances disposed of, there remains only *Eun.* 153.

Egon quicquam *cum istis factis* tibi respondeam?

The remedy here is not far to seek: egon quicquam *istis factis* tibi respondeam, or (since Terence sometimes postpones *-ne* for emphasis, e.g. *Phorm.* 518, 612) ego quicquam *istiscine factis*. . . .

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

5 The College, Glasgow.

ON JUVENAL I. 157 AND TACITUS, *ANNALS*, XV. 44.

In the first satire Juvenal illustrates his complaint that the times are out of joint by the introduction of sundry pictures and personages which confront him in the streets of Rome. The persons belong largely to the age of Nero; and suggest to some extent at any rate vivid personal recollection. The ruthless favourite of that emperor, Tigellinus, the rich freedmen Pallas and Licinus, the energetic official Ti. Claudius Alexander, the female poisoner Lucusta, were all upon the scene during Nero's reign, and in the passage i. 157 it may be supposed that we have an allusion to the 'living torches' of Nero (see Dürre, *Die zeitgeschichtlichen Beziehungen in den Satiren Juvenals*, p. 6). The story of the tortures inflicted on the Christians by Nero is well known, how, amongst other torments, some were condemned to be burnt at the stake in such a way that by a refinement of cruelty their flaming bodies served to give light at night. Tacitus, *Annals*, xv. 44, 'et pereuntibus addita ludibria, ut ferarum tergis contacti laniatu canum interirent, aut crucibus adfixi aut *flammando*, atque, ubi defecisset dies, in usum nocturni luminis urerentur.' In this passage I venture to read *flammando* 'by being set on fire,' which is nearer to the untranslatable *flammandi* of the MSS. than Nipperdey's *flammati*; and gives the same meaning as the parallel expression of Sulpicius Severus, *hist.* ii. 29, 'flamma usti.'

The horror of the thing, those sufferers clad in the flaming pitchy shirt of little ease (*tunica molesta*), did not go unnoticed by Seneca, who enumerates it among the devices of the torturer (*ep.* 14. 5, 'illam tunicam alimentis ignium et illitam et textam'); and who refers to it in the sarcastic words, which read like a satire on the motive alleged time without number by torturers in the interest of religion (*cons. ad Marciam*, 10. 6, 'alios ignibus peruret vel in poenam admotis vel in remedium'). Similarly he speaks of bodies planted in the ground and burnt (*de ira*, iii. 3. 6, 'circumdati defossis corporibus ignes'); and when he declares that the good conscience of the virtuous man is the one stand-by which does not desert him at the moment of such torment, it is scarcely

fanciful to suppose that the philosopher was thinking of the Christians and their creed, which had so much in common with his own stoicism (*de ben.* iv. 21. 6, 'quid nunc mihi prodest bona voluntas? prodest et in eculeo, prodest et in igne. qui si singulis membris admoveatur et paullatim vivum corpus circumeat, licet ipsum cor plenum bona conscientia stillet: placebit illi ignis, per quem bona fides collucebit'). See also Pliny, *paneg.* 33. I think it more than probable that in the passage in question Juvenal is registering a similar reminiscence.

Therefore in the new edition of my Oxford text I read

Pone Tigellinum: taeda lucebis in illa,
qua stantes ardent, qui fixo pectore fumant,
ut latum media sulcum dent lucis harena.

The reading *ut sulcum dent lucis* was suggested to me primarily by the difficulty of explaining *sulcum* here as 'a furrow,' to which I drew attention *C. R.* xi. 401; where following Maguire I interpreted *sulcus* as a 'streak of light': cp. Verg. *Aen.* ii. 697, Lucan, v. 527, to which passages I now add Sil. Ital. i. 357, 'sulcutum tremula secat aera flamma'; xv. 141, 'ardenti radiare per aera sulco.' Some few years ago Mr. John Jackson, who attended my lectures, influenced no doubt by the above consideration, cleverly proposed, in a college dissertation, to read *ut sulcum des lucis*. This bold method of dealing with the text had been in part anticipated by the conjecture *et sulcum dant lucis*, cited as due to 'adolescens quidam' by Dobree, *Adversaria*, ii. 387, mentioned in Mayor's additional note, and by Jahn wrongly ascribed to Dobree himself.

Judged palaeographically *dētlucis* = *dent lucis* is simple. The meaning will then be: 'If you portray Tigellinus, you will blaze among those faggots, where the wretches burn erect fastened by the chest, that they may provide a broad gleam of light in the middle of the sand.' This seems to me more effective than to make the poet say, 'and they provide, etc.' (Dobree), or 'that you may provide, etc.' (Jackson), because Juvenal thus states in the first line what the outspoken satirist has to expect, burning at the

stake; and in the relative sentence contained in the two following lines he amplifies with characteristic irony the grim utilitarian purpose which the victims were made to serve, the final clause *ut dent*, etc., being closely parallel to the language of Tacitus, where the purpose is conveyed by the words *in usum nocturnis luminis*. I may be permitted

to add that I am glad to find that my conjecture has been approved by so able a critic as Dr. Julius Ziehen in a review of my second edition in the *Philologische Wochenschrift* f. kl. Philologie, Nov. 20, 1908.

S. G. OWEN.

Christ Church, Oxford.

VARIA.

1. Plato Rep. i. 331 A.

γλυκεῖα οἱ καρδίαν ἀτάλλοισα γηροτρόφος συναορεῖ
ἐλπίς, ἃ μάλιστα θνατῶν πολύτροφον γνῶμαν
κυβερνᾷ.

Davies and Vaughan translate πολύτροφον by 'capricious'; Jowett by 'eager'; and Liddell and Scott by 'versatile.'

The word means 'much-turning,' and the picture is surely that of a ship whirled about among dangerous eddies and guided into safety by the helmsman's skill.

Cephalus is quoting a psalm of comfort for the aged whose hearts are torn to and fro (πολύτροφον) by fears of death (θνατῶν contains a point) until hope steers them into the haven of resignation.

In 328 B has it been pointed out that Thrasymachus' presence is explained by a natural desire to see the procession of his compatriots? His native town, Kalchedon, was in Bithynia, and the Bithynians were a Thracian stock.

2. Juvenal 15. 145.

Atque exercendis capiendisque artibus apti.

This is the reading of p and w. Duff after Bücheler has *pariendis*. Dr. Leeper, apparently reading *capiendis*, translates: 'fitted to practise and understand the arts of life.' This I suspect to be the sense, but why has corruption arisen? If we assume that the original ran *exercendis sapiendis* the source of error is obvious. P found an unintelligible *apiendis*, gave it up and recorded only *iendis*; whereas p and w 'corrected' to *capiendis*.

For *sapere*, with other than general objects, = understand cp. Cic. Div. 1. 58. 132. The antithesis is between artists, poets, orators, (*qui exercent*) and their public (*qui sapiunt*).

3. Horace Epist. 1. 16. 30.

cum pateris sapiens emendatusque vocari,
respondesne tuo, dic sodes, nomine?

Schütz (followed by Wilkins) holds that ne = nonne. But this is to overlook the stress on *tuo* by separation from *nomine*. The sense is: in allowing yourself to be called wise . . . are you answering to *your* name or some one else's? As if *utrum tuo an alieno respondes nomine?*

We may conjecture that the young soldier at roll-call, like the young student, was wont to answer to other names than his own in order to save a defaulting comrade. Horace says: when the name *sapiens emendatusque* is called, and you cry 'Adsum,' are you answering to your own name?

4. Vergil Aen. vi. 452-454.

ut primum iuxta stetit adgnovitque per umbras
obscuram, qualem primo qui surgere mense
aut videt aut vidisse putat per nubila lunam.

The construction of *qui* is so harsh that it seems better to read *quis*, cp. vi. 568 and *passim*. The 's' has dropped out by haplography.

5. Vergil Aen. vi. 567.

Castigatque auditque dolos, subigitque fateri . . .

Page has long ago exploded the ὅσπερ πρότερον hypothesis, but it might be pointed out that Conington's interpretation entails the further assumption that '*dolos* seems to be put generally for crime.' By *dolos* are meant the evasive accounts to which the torturer listens. He is not, however, so easily deceived, and forces confession of the whole truth.

H. DARNLEY NAYLOR.

The University, Adelaide.

REVIEWS

SANDYS' HISTORY OF CLASSICAL SCHOLARSHIP.

A History of Classical Scholarship. By J. E. SANDYS. Cambridge: University Press, 1908. Two vols. 8vo. Pp. xxviii + 498; xiii + 523. 61 portraits. 8s. 6d. each.

WITH the publication of these two stately volumes, extending from the Renaissance to the present day, there is brought to a close the first *complete* survey of classical scholarship extant in any language. Works of so comprehensive a range, for the record here unfolded covers a period of more than 2500 years, have hitherto been 'made in Germany,' and on this account alone the author is to be congratulated for having broken the time-honoured spell. The first volume, published in 1903,¹ appeared in a second edition in 1906, and closed with the name of Dante. In the meantime the author had issued his *Harvard Lectures on the Revival of Learning* (1905), an appetising 'gustatio' for the richly-laden banquet to follow.

The second volume opens with an account of the Revival of Learning in Italy and of Italian scholarship down to the sixteenth century (pp. 1-156). Passing by a few pages devoted to Spain and Portugal, which of all the countries of Europe have been least fertile in classical scholars, France is taken up from 1360-1600 (pp. 165-218), then England (pp. 219-250) and Germany (pp. 251-273) for the same period. A similar arrangement obtains for the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries—Italy (pp. 280-282, 373-384), France (pp. 283-299, 384-398), the Netherlands (pp. 300-352, 441-466), England (pp. 352-358, 401-439) and Germany (pp. 359-370). The third volume treats of German scholarship in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (pp. 1-273), the nearly 300 philologists being, however, distributed according to the subject-matter dealt with, to wit, editors of Latin or Greek classics, archaeologists, etc., a division apparently conducive to synoptical clearness,

¹ Reviewed at length in this journal, vol. xviii. pp. 271-276, 316-321.

but involving some inappropriate inclusions and necessitating at times the discussion of the work of the same man in widely separate places. It is here, too, that the author has often mentioned living scholars, whereas we are told in the preface that he purposed doing so only in a very few cases, such as Weil and Comparetti, 'where complete silence would have been unnatural,' but I submit that on such a plea a goodly number of illustrious philologists of Europe, happily still living, ought in justice to have been also included. The rest of the volume is taken up with the scholars of other nationalities—Italy (pp. 241-247), France (pp. 248-273), Holland (pp. 275-291), Belgium (pp. 292-309), Scandinavia (pp. 311-352), Greece and Russia (pp. 353-392), England (pp. 393-449) and the United States (pp. 450-470). The work closes with a brief retrospect (pp. 471-476) over the entire field covered in the three volumes, followed by addenda, including ten scholars who passed away while the book was in press.

Of the more than 1200 classical scholars recorded in the volumes before us, Germany leads with more than 400 names, 'proximus, sed longo intervallo proximus' comes England with more than 200, Italy with over 180, France with 150 and Holland with nearly 100 names. The list is well-nigh exhaustive;² in fact, many writers are treated at greater or less length whom one would hardly expect to find here, but, owing to the extremely liberal interpretation which Dr. S. gives to the term 'classical scholarship,' he has been free to admit the Latin poets of modern times, authors like Chaucer, Rabelais, Macchiavelli, Ben Jonson, statesmen and publicists of classical proclivities and humanistic enthusiasts generally.

To marshal this vast amount of information in such a way as to avoid throughout the monotony of a biographical dictionary was perhaps an impossible task. By the insertion,

² Of omissions I note in particular Papebroch, J. A. Symonds, Johannes Schmidt, F. Dümmler.

however, of anecdotal details, human touches and countless other items of more or less relevancy, Dr. S. has succeeded in overcoming this all but insuperable difficulty to a large extent, and, in consequence, he has produced for the most part an eminently readable book. Five chronological tables, a complete list of *editiones principes*, more than sixty well-executed portraits with a scrupulously exact account of their provenience, a select bibliography,¹ and last, but not least, two indexes of subject-matter—one for each volume—greatly enhance the value and usefulness of this magnum opus. These indexes constitute quite a feature of the book, for, apart from their exhaustiveness, Dr. Sandys has, besides many items of interest, included under the names of the ancient authors² the most noted editions of their works from the *editio princeps* down to the present day. The expediency of two separate and elaborate indexes seems to me, however, open to question. The author and the publishers probably thought that vol. ii. could thus the more easily be sold separately, and for that reason presumably the volumes are not distinguished numerically on the cover. But I can hardly imagine on what grounds any reader even remotely interested in the subject would be willing to purchase a torso!

If we look to the execution of the work as a whole, it may be said without exaggeration that we have a survey that is absorbingly interesting and highly instructive, and, above all, exhaustive and accurate, qualities the more noteworthy because

¹ Full bibliographical details are accumulated in the footnotes, but unfortunately these are too frequently so vague as to be of little use to one who hasn't access to a British Museum catalogue. Thus, to mention but one typical instance out of many: Vol. iii. p. 195⁷, we are told that a bibliography of Traube's writings was compiled by P. Lehmann. I fancy, there will be but few readers who will guess that the author refers to *Rendiconti della Reale accademia dei Lincei*, xvi. (1907), pp. 351-361, for the revised reprint in Traube's *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen*, i. (1909), pp. xlviii-lx, had not yet been published when the above note was written.

² Owing to an oversight, only two modern editions of Sallust are cited, the most important being omitted at that, though mentioned III. 200.

NO. CCH. VOL. XXIII.

Dr. S. had no complete records at his disposal, except for the Renaissance in Italy and for Germany, but even Bursian does not go beyond the year 1882. Errors of omission or commission and misprints are, considering the myriad details, astonishingly few and far between, and so rarely misleading that I prefer to communicate such as I have noticed to the author privately, lest their enumeration in this place convey the false impression of untrustworthiness, and thus do an injustice to a work which is an honour to English scholarship, and which will remain for many years to come one of the few indispensable books in the field of classical learning.¹

¹ A few trivial details, however, it will be well to point out here. Vol. ii. p. 71: For Sextus Pompeius read Sextus Pompeius Festus, or simply Festus. p. 114: For Tabula *Isiaca* (the same misprint occurs in the Index) read *Iliaca*. p. 209: No mention is made of Casaubon's famous and still useful dissertation, *De satyrica Graecorum poesi et Romanorum satira*. p. 219: Richard de Bury and Petrarch were hardly 'kindred spirits.' p. 297: Mabillon's description of Magliabecchi as 'a walking museum and a living library' (*museum inambulans et viva quaedam bibliotheca*) is not original, but a literal translation of the compliment which Eunapios, *Vita Soph.* p. 456^a,² paid to Longinus: βιβλιοθήκη τις ἢ ἐμψυχὸς καὶ περὶ παρὸν μουσεῖον, a fact which also escaped L. Traube, *Vorlesungen und Abhandl.* i. p. 21. p. 317: read 10 instead of '14 years later,' for Grotius died 1645. p. 328: The six letters of Bentley, published by Haupt, *Opusc.* iii. 89-107, are all addressed to Burman, not to Graevius. p. 441: P. Cornelius Severus is surely not 'the reputed author of the Aetna,' this ascription being a mere conjecture, found in a worthless Italian MS. On the same page Dr. S., following a long exploded notion, still attributes three Ps. Platonic dialogues (viz. Axiochus, Eryxias and *περὶ ἀρετῆς*) to Aeschines Socraticus. Vol. iii. p. 82: Bonnell's *Lexicon Quintil.* is fairly complete, but certainly in no sense 'admirable.' p. 164: Sauppe's library is now at Bryn Mawr College (Pa.), not at Columbia Univ. p. 173: The words 'an edition of the Metaphysics of Aristotle and Theophrastus, with the ancient scholia,' are misleading, as the τὰ μετὰ τὰ φύσικα of the latter are preserved only in meagre fragments, while the scholia belong to the former only, being not very ancient at that. pp. 317 and 362: If Heracleides Ponticus (for Ps. Heraclitus) be retained, 'Pseudo' ought at least to have been prefixed, for the author of the Homeric Allegories was certainly very much later than his alleged namesake, the famous pupil of Plato and Aristotle. p. 409: Why Donaldson is styled 'the principal (?) author of a work on The Theatre of the Greeks' is not clear to me.

In view of the transcendent merits of this work, it may seem invidious, as well as captious, to draw attention to one defect which characterizes the volumes before us, but it is too conspicuous to be passed by in silence. I mean the deplorable lack of a proper proportion or perspective in the treatment of a very great number of scholars. In the first place, no system or consistent plan is discernible in the use of brevier and long-primer type. Over and over again philologists of decidedly mediocre achievements are given undue typographical prominence, while many famous scholars are as often undeservedly dismissed in a few lines of brevier type. This discrepancy would be partially explained by a conjecture, which I am somewhat reluctant to advance, even though it may seem warranted by the facts. The author appears to have been intent on making out as good a showing as possible for the philological activity of every nation throughout the various centuries. Where genuinely great scholars at any one period existed in abundance, their achievements could easily be allowed to speak for themselves, but where classical scholars of the first magnitude were sadly lacking, as is the case in Italy during the seventeenth-nineteenth centuries, in France during the eighteenth-nineteenth centuries, in Belgium and Greece, and—'tis true 'tis pity, and pity 'tis 'tis true—also in the United States, Dr. S. unfortunately felt called upon to raise mediocrity to the *n*th power by giving to many an unjustifiable *spacial* prominence. Such a procedure undoubtedly does infinite credit to his cosmopolitan generosity and kindness of heart,¹ but it seems not quite compatible with the true function of an objective historian.

In order to substantiate so sweeping a charge, I append a list of names according to

the space allotted to them, those printed in *italics* being grossly overrated, while those cited in ordinary type have not received the attention to which their well-known achievements in the field of classical learning unquestionably entitle them:

3 lines— $\frac{1}{3}$ page: Cuiacius, B. Rhenanus, Middleton, Borghiss, de Rossi, d. Fabretti, Heindorf, Westphal (3 lines!), A. Kuhn, Nipperdey (5 lines!), Ahrens (12 lines), Steinthal, Studemund (12 lines), U. Köhler (3 lines), P. Tannery (3 lines!), Traube.

$\frac{1}{2}$ p.— $\frac{2}{3}$ page: Melancthon, Camerarius, Perizonius, Valckenaer, Kaibel, L. Spengel, Kirchhoff.

$\frac{2}{3}$ p.—1 p.: Turnebus, *Dorat*, A. Johnston, *Strada*, Du Cange, Gronovius, *Dempster*, Prantl, Usener, Rohde, *Gantrelle*, *Nisard*, *Benoist*, *Graux*, *Waddington*, *Rayet*, Grote, Bücheler, Zeller.

pp. 1—1 $\frac{1}{2}$: *Nizolius*, D. Heinsius, L. Vossius, *Duport*, *Barrow*, *Damm*, J. F. Christ, *Creuzer*, *Goethe*, *Lehrs*, *Nutzhorn*, *Cornelissen*, *Falster*.

pp. 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ —2: *Sigonius*, *Macchiavelli*, *Lambinus*, *Vives*, *Salmasius*, *Downes*, *Bacon*, *Twining*, *Dawes*, *Montfaucon*, *Le Clerc*, *Lobeck*, A. Schäfer, *Gennadios*, *Kennedy*.

pp. 2—2 $\frac{1}{2}$: *Pomponius Laetus*, *Robertelli*, *Dolet*, *Rabelais* (2 pp. brevier), *Linacre*, *Lipsius*, *Selden*, *Parr*, *Jebb*, *Köchly*, L. Müller.

pp. 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ —3: *Ascham*, *Buchanan*, *Ritschl*, *Roersch*.

pp. 3—3 $\frac{1}{2}$: *Saville*, *Winckelmann*, *Willemis*.

pp. 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ —4: *Scaliger*, *Mabillon*, *Milton*, *Gesner*, *Niebuhr*, *Lachmann*.

pp. 5: *Casaubonus*, *Herder*, *Boeckh*.

pp. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$: *Lessing*, being exceeded only by *Petrarch*, *Bentley*, and F. A. Wolf!

This list—it might have been indefinitely augmented—in the mere juxtaposition of names speaks a sufficiently eloquent language, but one or two points may still be noted. I do not begrudge the *four* pages given up to the paleographer *Mabillon*, but if he be entitled to them, how can it be possibly justified that L. Traube is dismissed in eighteen lines of small type?! A full page in brevier is taken up with a synopsis of

¹In the biographical portions the author also acts on the principle of *de mortuis nil nisi bonum*, grave faults of character and conduct being often either ignored, as e.g. in the case of Lenormant, or merely alluded to in passing. The only noteworthy exception is *Filelfo*, who is said to have 'combined the accomplishments of a scholar with the insidiousness and the brutality of a brigand,' but how few Renaissance scholars, if judged by their moral character, would 'escape a whipping'?

Nutzhorn's *Die Entstehungsweise der homerischen Gedichte*. This book is mainly negative and polemical in character, and marks no real advance toward the solution of the problems in question. But granting that 'its patriotic spirit makes it (for our present purpose) a characteristic product of the scholarship of Denmark'—a very curious justification, by the way—how are we to account for the fact that *Kirchhoff's* epoch-making contribution to the Homeric question is only accorded four lines? Fully three pages are devoted to the Belgian *Willems*. His ponderous volumes on the Roman Senate certainly are a vast thesaurus of facts, but the conclusions which he draws from the documentary evidence are, as Mommsen has shown, extremely often hasty, fanciful, or due to misinterpretation. But if this work be deemed worthy of half a page of panegyric, what shall be said of the fact that the monumental *Staatsrecht* of Mommsen must be content with two lines?!

Belgium is accorded a separate chapter; the 17½ pages (partly small print) are distributed among eleven scholars, and the account of their alleged achievements is throughout pitched in a highly eulogistic key, the author following all too complacently the fulsome biographies of national writers. In the case of *Roersch*, Dr. S. seems himself to have had some slight misgivings, for, after devoting three pages of large type to him, we are treated to the following apologetic epilogue: 'His administrative duties left him little leisure for any work on an extensive scale. But he was fully capable of producing works of far larger compass, any one of which might have ensured him a permanent place in the history of the scholarship of his country.' Surely this is to have greatness thrust upon you with a vengeance! If potential erudition, latent capacity and κρηματα ἐς αἰ, which were never composed, are to entitle a philologist to an extensive consideration in a history of classical scholarship, it is impossible to understand how Dr. S. succeeded in forcing so glorious a record into the Procrustean bed of two volumes! *Nève* is the author of an interesting but discursive work on the history of learning in Belgium, beginning with Erasmus(!), but omitting—incredible dictu—J.

Lipsius! He is styled a man of considerable note—two pages are accorded to him, and yet his published work was chiefly confined to oriental languages and but incidentally touched on classical subjects! But if Belgium (since 1830), which did not produce a single classical scholar of first rank, is thus handsomely treated, and practically the same is true, as already remarked, of Scandinavia and of Greece, the space allotted to the classical scholarship of the United States (pp. 450–470) is—pudet dictu—simply ultra-generous and undeservedly flattering. So unpalatable a truth must here be the more emphasized, because coming from any other than an American source (for 'caelum, non animum mutant qui trans mare currunt') the motive for giving public utterance to it might be misconstrued, if not resented. Among the American philologists of the past there were certainly many men of profound erudition and general culture, of singular personal charm, magnetic personalities, in fact, and brilliant teachers, who succeeded in instilling into their pupils not only an abiding love for the humanities, but also a deep affection for themselves, which repeatedly found outward expression in subsequently published biographical sketches. It was upon these that Dr. S. unfortunately mainly relied, but such *laudationes funebres* constitute no more unbiassed documents for the historian to-day than they did in the days of Cicero and Livy. Scholars like F. D. Allen, Merriam, Hayley and Earle, to judge by the publications which they have left behind them, would presumably have produced more works of a high order, had not a cruel fate cut them off in the prime of life. But the literary output of the others was almost without exception wholly devoid of originality, independence, imaginative insight and critical acumen. Anthon and A. W. Allen, Greenough and Lincoln and Harkness, Drisler and Short and Lewis, Felton and Hadley and Woolsey—to mention only these—were one and all skilful compilers of lucrative school editions and grammars and dictionaries, the frequently wholesale adaptation of the work of foreign scholars being usually indicated by the ominous semi-euphemism 'based on the

edition of so-and-so.' Not a single contribution marking genuine progress, no work on an extensive scale, opening up a new perspective or breaking entirely new ground, nothing, in fact, of the slightest scientific value can be placed to their credit.¹ Unquestionably the most valuable legacy of these scholars is not to be sought in their books (some of them, indeed, published but little), but in the goodly number of brilliant pupils still living, 'qui olim nominabuntur, nunc intelleguntur,' so that some future edition of this work or some future Sandys will not be open to the criticism of a candid reviewer of

¹ The Greek Lexicon of Sophocles and the work of C. Beck, 'the Petronian scholar,' are only apparent exceptions, for both of these Harvard professors were born and educated abroad. Nor can Seymour's *Life in the Homeric Age* be exempted, except in the eyes of loving friends. Whitney, the only philologist of genius whom America has produced in the past, was unfortunately in no proper sense a classical scholar.

having grossly exaggerated the achievements of the United States in the field of classical scholarship.

But regret, as one must, that a glaring inequality of treatment, a lack of discriminating appraisal or proper evaluation is too conspicuously in evidence in these volumes, the incontrovertible fact remains, as remarked at the outset, that we now possess, thanks to the profound learning and the indefatigable labour of one man, as exhaustive a record of the representatives of classical scholarship and their works as one could desire. There cannot be the slightest doubt that these volumes will pass through several editions in the near future, and that the distinction of being translated into a number of foreign tongues will also be accorded to them in due time.

ALFRED GUDEMAN.

Munich.

THE ROMAN LAW OF SLAVERY.

The Roman Law of Slavery. By W. W. BUCKLAND, M.A., of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law, Fellow and Tutor of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1908. Pp. xii + 735.

THIS work, as its sub-title indicates, deals with the condition of the slave in private law from Augustus to Justinian, and is not concerned, except incidentally, with the freedman. The topic of slavery occupies a peculiar position in the modern study of Roman law. So long as the main interest was the application of Roman law as a living system, slavery was of no importance, because obsolete. But now that the interest is chiefly historical, it has become of the greatest moment to the student, since it permeates every department of the ancient law, of which it is, as our author with a little exaggeration observes, the most characteristic part. Hence while there was no need for it, there was no comprehensive treatise on this

topic as a whole, and since the change in point of view the want of such a treatise has been felt.

Mr. Buckland has supplied this want with a completeness that deserves the highest praise. We can say of his work what we can say of no other English work on Roman law, that it is the standard book, and will be necessary to the library of every one whose study of Roman law extends beyond the Institutes.

Part I. is logically arranged. After an interesting first chapter, in which the definition of slave is discussed, chapters ii. and iii. treat of the slave regarded as a chattel, chapters iv. and v. of his non-commercial relations, chapters vi. and vii. of his commercial relations apart from the peculium, chapters viii. and ix. of his commercial relations in connexion with the peculium, while the remaining chapters of this part are devoted to special cases such as those of the servus vicarius, hereditarius, fugitivus and many others.

The subject of Part II. is enslavement and manumission, and here an historical arrangement by periods has been adopted, with the result that a connected view of the various topics is not obtained: for instance, manumission *vindicta* must be hunted up in three places, pp. 441, 451, and 552. It might have been better to give an historical account of each of the modes of manumission one by one. Still the author is probably the best judge, as any one who has faced the actual difficulty of arranging a large mass of material will be ready to believe; and certainly the reader armed with the excellent table of contents and index will have no difficulty in finding his way to a given point. That after all is what matters with a work like the present, which is not to read continuously, but is chiefly for reference.

We could wish that we had been provided with a 'Quellenregister,' so that the author's interpretation of a hard passage in the Digest would have been as accessible as the comment of an English text-book on a decided case, but no doubt the number of passages discussed would have made the compilation of such an additional index a laborious task. With more justice we may complain that the modern punctuation of Digest references has not been adopted; it is a real source of delay to find for instance: D. 41. 1. 10. 3, 4, 19, 54. pr., instead of D. 41, 1, 10, 3. 4; 19; 54, pr.: see Girard, Manuel, pp. ix and x. There is no reason why Digest references should continue to be as bewildering as they have been in the past.

Apart from these superficial criticisms, we have nothing but praise for this extremely learned work, in which every point is discussed with a wealth of citations both of texts and literature. We only regret that it is beyond our power to do it full justice, but since to review it as a whole would require many months of study, the results of which would occupy several articles, we can only endeavour to give the reader some idea of its methods by presenting its treatment of one or two topics upon which we have had occasion to consult it.

The principle is well known that a *bona fide* *serviens*, whether a *liber homo* or a *servus alienus*, acquires for his supposed master *ex*

operis suis vel ex re ejus, but *extra duas istas causas* for himself or for his real master, as the case may be: Gaius 2, 92. But the application of the principle is naturally difficult: take, for example, the fragment of Pomponius, D. 41, 1, 21, which states as the opinion of Proculus that if my slave *bona fide tibi serviens* buys and takes *traditio* of a thing, it does not become mine because I am not in possession of the slave, nor does it become yours unless the acquisition is *ex re tua*. Inconsistently it is admitted that if the acquisition were not *ex re*, the *liber homo b. f. serviens* would acquire for himself in such a case. Now one might puzzle for some time over the opinion which denies that a *servus alienus b. f. serviens* does not acquire for his real owner by taking a *traditio* outside the two *causae* (*ex re vel ex operis*), but Mr. Buckland (p. 341) at once goes to the root of the matter by pointing out that the text rests on the notion that acquisition by *traditio* depends on the passing of possession, whereas, in fact, acquisition by *traditio* does not involve acquisition of possession. On this last difficult point we should have liked further enlightenment, but with characteristic avoidance of side-issues the author simply refers us to Salkowski, *Sklavenerwerb*, and Appleton, *Propriété Prétorienne*. We have not pursued the subject.

In a neighbouring passage, D. 41, 1, 19, Pomponius raises a well-known crux, that the acquisition by a *liber homo b. f. mihi serviens* of an *hereditas jussu meo* involves on his part at least the act of *aditio*, though the great preponderance of opinion is that such an acquisition is not *ex operis*, nor indeed *ex re*. But the rejected opinion is still considered worthy of mention by Aristo and Pomponius, and had agitated the republican lawyer Varro Lucullus, and also Trebatius, whom Mr. Buckland overlooks. The point at issue is really the conception of acquisition *ex operis*, of which, following Salkowski, our author takes a narrow view. 'It covers,' he says at p. 342, 'only the case of the slave hiring himself out or his service being in some way active for a third person for hire,' or as he puts the matter below, 'the opera involved in acquisition *ex operis* is not that expended in making the acquisition,

but that which is the consideration for the acquisition.' The main argument for this definition of *operae* appears to be the texts D. 7, 8, 12, 6; 14, pr., against which must be set Ulp. D. 7, 1, 23, 1: 'Quoniam autem diximus quod ex operis adquiritur ad fructuarium pertinere, sciendum est etiam cogendum eum operari.' Without having seen Salkowski's argument, we think that this central point might have been considered at greater length, but at any rate under such a conception of acquisition ex operis it is quite clear that *aditio* of an *hereditas* does not fall.

Julian, D. 29, 2, 45, pr., quoted by Mr. Buckland, expressly says 'Aditio hereditatis non est in opera servili,' and therefore that a *servus fructuarius* cannot make *aditio* by order of the usufructuary. Yet he goes on to state as a possible opinion that a *liber homo bona fide mihi serviens*, who has been instituted *heres propter me*, and makes *aditio jussu meo*, acquires thereby for me. This is not the prevalent view, and the ground on which Julian puts it is interesting: 'ut intellegatur non opera sua mihi adquirere, sed ex re mea, sicut in stipulando et per traditionem accipiendo ex re mea mihi adquirat.' If we are to have a narrow conception of 'ex operis,' we must widen our views of 'ex re.'

Now it is clear from these texts that a narrow conception of 'ex operis' was by no means universal, and Salkowski accounts for the discrepancy of opinion by supposing a development of the principle of acquisition ex re out of acquisition ex operis, a process which incidentally narrowed down the earlier wide conception of *operae*. Mr. Buckland is more cautious, and asks what is the reason for saying that 'ex re' is the later development. This leads to an interesting reference to the ultimate ground of acquisition for the *bona fide possessor*, into which we cannot enter.

We hope we have given the reader an idea of the sort of help he will get by consulting

this work. Our impression is that not only will he find the fullest references of every kind, but also a thoroughly fundamental discussion of ultimate principles. On the other hand, the book is quite unsuitable for general reading, in spite of its length its style is usually compressed, even too much so, and above all the author assumes that the reader has the texts before him. Hence he does not tell his own story, and we have to turn up the text before we can appreciate his argument. We do not say this by way of criticism, but merely to advertise the character of the work.

Some chapters are, of course, more readable than others: thus in Part I. we recommend the introductory chapter and chapter 9 on the *peculium*. Part II. enjoys the advantage of a more dramatic subject, and any one interested in legal antiquities will be fascinated by the learning and good sense with which the forms of *manumission* are discussed. We observe that, like the majority of Romanists, Mr. Buckland rejects Karlowa's view that *manumission vindicta* was not in origin an *in jure cessio*, and he makes a strong case (p. 451). On p. 446 he returns to the subject of the informal *manumissions* with which he has dealt more fully in a recent article, *Nouvelle Revue Historique*, 1908, p. 234; in a general way he agrees with Wlassak's conclusion that they were not absolutely free from form, but he shows that in a real sense they were informal.

We leave with regret these and other topics (see especially the Appendices) which Mr. Buckland handles with complete mastery. His whole work shows a rare combination of patient research and grasp of detail, with breadth of view and command of principle, and is certainly the most important work on Roman private law that has appeared in this country, with the possible exception of Mr. Roby's two volumes.

F. DE ZULUETA.

New College, Oxford.

THE WORKS OF ARISTOTLE.

The Works of Aristotle. Translated into English under the editorship of J. A. SMITH, M.A., and W. D. ROSS, M.A. Part I. *The Parva Naturalia.* Part II. *De Lineis Insecabilibus.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908. Two vols. Vol. I. 3s. 6d.; Vol. II. 2s. 6d.

THESE, the first instalments of the new Oxford translation of Aristotle, promise well for the usefulness and success of the enterprise. In Prof. J. I. Beare of Dublin, who has done the larger part of the work in the first volume, the editors have secured the co-operation of one who is not only an experienced scholar but a recognised expert in all that pertains to ancient Greek psychology. And the translations of the minor sections (*de long. et brev. vitae, de iuv. et senect., de vita et morte, de respiratione*) contributed by Mr. G. R. T. Ross, while of a less testing and difficult character, are done with adequate skill and care.

In the preface written by the general editors which accompanies the volumes the plan and principles of the series are thus indicated: 'The translations make no claim to finality, but aim at being such as a scholar might construct in preparation for a critical edition and commentary. The translation will not presuppose any critical reconstitution of the text. Wherever new readings are proposed the fact will be indicated, but notes justificatory of conjectural emendations or defensive of novel interpretations will, where admitted, be reduced to the smallest compass. The editors, while retaining a general right of revision and annotation, will leave the responsibility for each translation to its author, whose name will in all cases be given.'

Fortunately the editors have seen fit to allow to Prof. Beare and to Mr. H. H. Joachim, the translator of Part II., considerable latitude as regards the addition of notes on questions of text and interpretation. Both in the *de sensu* and its fellows and in the *de lin. insec.* there occur quite a long list of places where the editor finds himself in straits between 'the devil' of nonsense and the 'deep sea'

of purely conjectural restoration. Did space permit, one might produce a number of instances in which both Mr. Joachim and Prof. Beare have resisted the devil and made him flee—at least for a short season—by adopting the heroic alteration, ὥσπερ οἱ κυβιστῶντες καὶ εἰς ὀρθὸν τὰ σκέλη περιφερόμενοι! And since the next best thing to making sense of one's author is the convicting him of writing unintelligible nonsense, one may freely commend the work of both these scholars as excellent examples both of critical acumen and of reconstructive skill. Another point about the method of translation may be noticed: words or phrases not in the Greek but necessary or useful for the elucidation of the meaning are inserted in the body of the translation enclosed in square brackets; and when the page is so richly be-bracketed, as not a few of these are, the effect is displeasing. Part I. is furnished with an index, but, for some unexplained reason, Part II. is not. The books are well produced, and about the only material error I have noticed is in the footnote (1) on 457a, where λήθαργος apparently ought to be ληθάργους.

R. G. BURY.

The Works of Aristotle. Translated into English under the editorship of J. A. SMITH, M.A., and W. D. ROSS, M.A. Vol. VIII. *Metaphysica*, by W. D. ROSS. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908. 8vo.

UNLIKE the *Ethics*, which has often attracted the pen of the ready writer of notes or versions, the *Metaphysics* has received but scant attention. Nor indeed is the work of translating it a work to be lightly undertaken. The successful interpreter of a treatise often so obscure and difficult, always so dry and bald in style, cannot safely indulge—however pressing the temptation—in even occasional lapses into dormitation: he must leave that luxury for his author. The translation now before us, judging from considerable portions which I have examined with some care, is wholly, or almost wholly, free from such lapses. It is not only reliable in point

of accuracy, it possesses the further merit of simplicity and clearness, and reproduces well such virtues—they are not many—as can be claimed for the style of the original. The text adopted is, in the main, that of W. Christ (1895), and where Mr. Ross departs from this—as he does pretty often—the fact is signified in the notes. With regard to these notes, however, there is one general criticism I venture to make. Would it not be more clear and satisfactory to the reader if the authority for the lection adopted were stated in all cases? Often the change indicated is simply a reversion to the MS. tradition which Christ had discarded, but sometimes it is the adoption of a new conjecture; and at the expense of a very little extra space the student using the book might have been informed of the precise facts on each occasion. For this fault of method, as it seems to me, the blame rests, perhaps, rather with the general editors, who pursue a policy of rigid Laconism, than with the particular translator. Brevity is sometimes the soul less of wit than obscurity; and obscurity we find in several of Mr. Ross's notes. For example: '985^b 18 read τὸ δὲ Ε τοῦ Η θέσει. Cf. Gomperz, *Greek Thinkers*, i. 568': the change is excellent, but are we to understand that Gomperz is the originator? Again, how is a reader with Christ's text only before him to understand the note '988^b 28–29 read τῷ γῆν (?) . . . τῷ ῥαδίως. Cf. I. Bywater in *J. of Ph.* xxviii. 246.'

Apart from this one complaint, there is little fault to find with the book: it is (in spite of γῆν) well printed and furnished with a useful short analysis and a carefully compiled index. Mr. Ross deserves to be warmly thanked for the pains he has bestowed on his lengthy task, and complimented also on the skill and scholarship with which he has brought it to so successful a completion.

R. G. B.

Divisiones quae vulgo dicuntur Aristoteleae.

Ed. H. MUTSCHMANN. Teubner, 1907.

Pp. xlii + 76.

THE 'Aristotelian Divisions' here printed are drawn from Diog. Laert. iii. 80–109 and from the Codex Marcianus 257. The

arrangement adopted by Mr. Mutschmann is to print first the 32 'divisions' of Diogenes, with the corresponding divisions of the Codex in parallel columns, and then to print afterwards in order the remaining divisions of the Codex, of which there are 69 in all. In the Preface, the editor gives us a sketch of the history of *δικίρεσις* as a logical method in Plato, Aristotle and the earlier Peripatetic school, with other matters pertaining to the question of origins, his conclusion being that 'divisionum nostrarum maiorem partem e veteri Academia et Peripato fluxisse.' At the foot of the text the editor prints not only critical notes but also—and this is a specially useful feature of the book—the pertinent *testimonia*, i.e. references to the parallels in Plato, Aristotle, etc. In addition to the earlier work at the text done by Cobet and V. Rose, the editor has had the advantage of consulting with Sudhaus and Wendland, whose names appear frequently in the foot-notes, and the result is decidedly good. Not that all doubtful points are finally settled; but most of these are likely to remain always in doubt, unless fresh evidence should be forthcoming. My remarks on matters of detail must be brief: D.L. 2, the notion of *ἐρωτικὴ φιλία* might be illustrated from Xenophon. D.L. 5, Mutschmann's *ἔργον*, for *θετόν* of codd., is better than Cobet's *θεατόν* or Wendland's *τέλος*, and probably right. D.L. 8, it would seem more scientific to insert <καὶ ἀπολογίας> before rather than after καὶ κατηγορίας, and after καὶ εἰς (just above) perhaps κρίσεις might be inserted more plausibly than δικαστήρων. D.L. 11, τὰ δὲ πρὸς νόμους κτλ.; Wendland conj. περὶ for πρὸς, Mutsch. κατά, but read perhaps τὰ δὲ πρὸς <ὠφέλειαν οἶον> νόμος κτλ. (comparing the Marcian parallel). D.L. 13, the ed. after Sudhaus reads ἡ δὲ ἀνδρεία τοῦ . . . μὴ [ἐξίστασθαι] τρεῖν, the MSS. having μὴ ἐξ. ποιεῖν: Cobet deleted ποιεῖν, and Wendland conj. ποίῳ in place of it; more probable might be τόπον or τόπων. D.L. 19, for the 4th species a ref. should be added to the famous def. in the *Sophist*. Cod. M. 15, νόμοις φαύλοις καὶ μετρίοις: it is unlikely that μετρίοις stands for μοχθηροῖς, as the ed. suggests; read

perhaps ἀμέτρους or ἀλλοτρίους. Cod. M. 6; if, as Sudhaus plausibly suggests, ἔχθρα is a blunder for καχεξία, we must transpose and write οὖν <καχεξία> νόσος κτλ. Cod. M. 30; read perhaps τὸ δὲ λέγειν <ὅτι> 'οὗτος ἐστὶν ἀληθὴς λόγος', ὁ λόγος οὗτος ἀληθὴς ἐστίν· ἐστὶ γὰρ πρᾶγμα κτλ. Cod. M. 41, ἡ δὲ ἐν τῷ σώματι ἀταξία κτλ.: rather than change ἀκολασία to ἀταξία twice, and add ἀταξία the third time,—as the editor proposes,—I should prefer to excise ἀκολασία twice. Cod. M. 42, the restoration proposed by the editor,—ὡς τὰ πολιτικά ἢ ἀνομοίως for ἡ τὰ π. ἢ ἀνόμοια,—has much probability, but why did he not go further and change the next ἡ to καί, to correspond with the other sentence-endings?

R. G. B.

Aristotelis de Animalibus Historia. Textum recognovit L. DITTMAYER. Teubner, 1907. Pp. xxvi + 467.

Textstudien zur Tiergeschichte des Aristoteles. VON GUNNAR RUDBERG. Uppsala: Akademiska Bokhandeln, 1908. Pp. xxvi + 107.

It is safe to say that the new Teubner text marks a considerable advance in the study of the 'History of Animals.' The latest and best of previous editions was that of Aubert and Wimmer, of which Mr. Dittmeyer speaks in eulogistic terms, and to which, as his footnotes show, he is largely indebted; but, as regards their use of the manuscripts, Aubert and Wimmer were open to the criticism that 'criticis eorum ad-

notationibus non omnino fides haberi potest.' We may trust that in this respect the Teubner edition will prove reliable; and the editor claims that he records 'codicum A^oC^a' (i.e. the representatives of the best family) *omnes lectiones varias.*

Mr. Rudberg's 'Textstudien,' however, make it pretty certain that even the new Teubner text is not to be regarded as final. Mr. Rudberg deals mainly with William of Moerbeke's translation of the *Hist. An.*, giving a transcription of William's rendering of Book I. with the manuscript variants. He examines William's language and method of translation, and investigates the relation in which his Latin stands to the various Greek manuscripts. And finally he draws certain conclusions regarding the genealogy of the sources for the text—a problem which Dittmeyer, in his 'praefatio,' leaves untouched. Mr. Rudberg postulates an archetype, as representative of the first period of the text's history; as representative of the second period, he assumes the two archetypes which were the immediate sources of the two main families generally recognized (viz. A^a etc., and P etc.); close to this second period he places x, the source of William's Latin translation; and in the third period falls the division into the two families A^a, P. Whether these broader conclusions win acceptance or not (and they seem to require further proof), this careful study of William's style and value should prove indispensable to future investigators of the text of Aristotle. R. G. B.

CICERO'S ORATORY IN RELATION TO HIS RHETORICAL STUDIES.

1. *De M. Tulli Ciceronis Studiis Rhetoricis* thesim Facultati Litterarum Universitatis Parisiensis proponebat L. LAURAND. Paris: A. Picard et Fils. 1907. 8vo. Pp. xx, 116. Fr. 3.
2. *Études sur le Style des Discours de Cicéron, avec une Esquisse de l'Histoire du 'Cursus.'* Par L. LAURAND. Paris: Hachette et C^{ie}. 1907. 8vo. Pp. xxxix, 388. Fr. 7.50.

THESE two books, taken together, give an interesting and able estimate of Cicero as

a student of rhetoric and as a master of oratorical style.

The topics discussed in the Latin thesis are as follows:

I. What value did Cicero set upon the art of rhetoric? The conclusion reached is that he did not, as has sometimes been supposed, depreciate studies of this kind, but simply maintained that they must be conjoined with natural gifts, practice, and a well-stored mind.

II. What did he owe to 'the ancients'—to Plato, Isocrates, the disciples of Isocrates, Aristotle, and the earlier Peripatetics (Theophrastus especially)? The general answer to these questions is sought in Cicero's own avowal, 'ego me saepe nova videri dicere intellego, cum pervetera dicam, sed inaudita plerisque' (Cic. *Or.* 3, 12), while the warning is added that we must not assume him always, or even often, to have gone direct to the original sources.

III. What did he owe to authorities nearer his own time,—to Hermagoras,—to Asiatic and Rhodian rhetoricians,—to Stoic, Academic, and Latin writers? The answer suggested is that he drew his material more freely from recent than from ancient teachers.

IV. What did he himself contribute to the art of rhetoric, and how far did his opinions undergo modification? M. Laurand holds that Cicero was no slavish follower of the text-books he used, but that his true self appears not only in the style of his rhetorical writings, but in the stress which they lay on appeals to the sense of mirth and to the emotions generally, in the importance attached to the popular verdict as helping to determine the rank of an orator, and in the broad view taken of the general training which an orator needs. And as for modification, it would be strange indeed if his views did not change and develop during the thirty or forty years, spent in the practice of oratory, which separate the 'De Inventione' from the 'De Oratore,' the 'Brutus,' and the 'Orator.'

It is this practice of oratory which forms Cicero's chief distinction. Among all the ancient writers on rhetoric, he was by far the greatest speaker. Accordingly, in the French *Études* which accompany the Latin dissertation, he is studied in relation to the style of his published speeches. The result is highly interesting and instructive. Cicero is here seen at his best, whether the topic under discussion is the purity of his language (in regard to choice of words or to grammar), or his oratorical rhythm, or the variety of his style. M. Laurand pays much attention to a point superficially so trivial, but really so characteristic, as the end-rhythms of the Ciceronian sentence.

Alike from his theory in the *Orator*, and from his actual practice in his speeches, it is clear that Cicero had his favourite endings (particularly the dichoreus, e.g. *persolutas, comprobavit*; and the cretic, e.g. *curiam, [de]cernitur*). Following in the wake of Zielinski and other inquirers, M. Laurand marshals under this heading a large number of facts, which he discusses with much acumen and independence. He is quite alive to the vagueness, vacillation, and inconsistency by which modern analyses of the Ciceronian clausulae have often been marked; but he has no difficulty in showing that definite principles, or at all events preferences, are involved, and that there is a real accord between the precepts of the *Orator* and the practice of the speeches. He also subjoins an interesting appendix on the 'cursus,' or those regular cadences which mark the end of phrases (or members of phrases) in Latin prose from the classical period to the time of the Renaissance.

In pp. 284–295 Cicero's 'temperatus' (as applied to style) might perhaps have been compared with *εὐκράτος*, which (and not *κοινός*) is given by the Florentine manuscript in chapters 21 and 24 of Dionysius' treatise *De Compositione Verborum*. On p. 125 reference is made to the fact that while rhyme is pleasing to the modern ear in verse, it is displeasing in prose. It would, however, not be safe to assume that the ancients generally liked their prose to be loaded with those assonances (*ὁμοιοτέλευτα*) which are the forerunners of our modern rhyme. Cicero, no doubt, loved them, as his speeches clearly show. But would a Greek really have admired such a sentence as: 'Ubi sunt, C. Pansa, illae cohortationes pulcherrimae tuae, quibus a te excitatus senatus, inflammatus populus Romanus non solum audivit sed etiam didicit nihil esse homini Romano foedius servitute?' Here again Dionysius, in the same work, helps to give us the true point of view. Assonance is good, but not when it degenerates into jingle; when variety comes into conflict with monotony, variety must be preferred. Dionysius saw clearly that an inflected language, while rendering great freedom of word-order possible without any sacrifice of clearness, needs this variety

all the more because of the monotonous effect of its recurring case-terminations. Consequently he says (*de Comp. Verb.* c. 12), 'We must not hesitate to change the cases of nouns (since, if continued unduly, they greatly offend the ear), and we must constantly, in order to guard against satiety, break up the effect of sameness entailed by placing many nouns, or verbs, or other parts of speech in close succession.' On this ground, Dionysius would have condemned the collocation, 'excitatus senatus, inflammatus populus Romanus.' Very probably he would also have taken exception to the reiteration of *s* sound. 'Sigma,' he says,

'is a letter devoid of charm, disagreeable, and positively offensive when used to excess. A hiss seems a sound more suited to a brute beast than to a rational being. At all events, some of the ancients used it sparingly and guardedly. There are, indeed, cases in which entire odes have been composed without a sigma' (*de C. V.* c. 14).

While it is possible that M. Laurand's two volumes might occasionally have gained by being brought into still fuller relation with Greek literary theory, it is certain that their general execution shows great competence.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

OXFORD ANTHROPOLOGICAL ESSAYS.

Anthropology and the Classics. Six lectures delivered before the University of Oxford by ARTHUR J. EVANS, ANDREW LANG, GILBERT MURRAY, F. B. JEVONS, J. L. MYRES, W. WARDE FOWLER. Edited by R. R. MARETT. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908. 8vo. Pp. 191. Twenty-two figures. 6s. net.

THE volume before us is of good omen. One might on verbal grounds suppose, as Mr. Marett remarks in his preface, that Anthropology and the Humanities were co-extensive, but in practice they have been widely sundered. The six lectures here published were given last Michaelmas Term at the instance of the Committee of Anthropology with the avowed object of bringing the two subjects together, of 'inducing classical scholars to study the lower culture as it bears upon the higher.'

Oxford may well be proud of the list of classical scholars who answer to the call of Anthropology; she could command authorities at first hand on well nigh every branch of the subject. Dr. Arthur Evans lectured on *The European Diffusion of Primitive Pictography and its Bearings on the Origin of Script*; Mr. Andrew Lang on *Homer and Anthropology*; Professor Gilbert Murray on *The Early Greek Epic*; Dr. Jevons on *Graeco-Italian Magic*; Professor Myres on

Herodotus and Anthropology, and Mr. Warde Fowler on *Lustratio*.

Instead of attempting to resume or criticise the varied contents of these lectures—a task manifestly impossible in brief space—we may be permitted to ask and answer the question: 'Does the volume before us approve the new venture?' Will the normal classical scholar or student laying it down feel that Anthropology can really illuminate the Classics, or is Anthropology only the last straw imposed on the already overburdened camel?

Take Mr. Warde Fowler's *Lustratio*. When a man reads

dum montibus umbrae
Lustrabunt convexa,

he needs no Anthropology to tell him that *lustrare* is a word of magical beauty; if he can feel anything in language he can feel *that*. But why is *lustrare* so moving, so stately, so religious? Just because it has in it two elements, the purgational, the processional. *Lustratio* is the slow perambulation, the 'beating of the bounds' to purge your newly won clearing from alien, hostile spirits. Anthropology gives back to a word—hackneyed for Cicero to the mere 'review' of an army—its primitive colour and atmosphere. Knowledge of this sort makes language worth learning and life worth living.

Herodotus and Anthropology simply teems with suggestion. Prof. Myres thinks so hard and so swiftly, he is so cogent, so alert and yet so intricate—mental states rarely combined—that he leaves reader and reviewer gasping. Frequently he convicts us, not only of ignorance, but of a certain torpor and slovenliness of thought. We imagined, for example, that we knew what φύσις and νόμος meant. But now the outlook of the ἀνθρωπολόγος of the fifth century B.C. is analysed and reconstructed anew. For lack of that imaginative effort we had not realized how modern is the embryology of Anaximander, how evolutionary was Archelaos. We had somehow forgotten that the medical school of Cos was but two hours' sail from Halicarnassus, and that the physiology and anthropology of Hippocrates was superior by far to anything that came after till the seventeenth century. The formula of Heracleitus, πάντα ῥεῖ καὶ οὐδὲν μένει, spite of its application to metaphysics, had its origin in physical science as a generalization from experience. 'It emphasized the kinetic and physiological aspect of nature and of science, which has ever been of so far higher value, in research, as in life, than the static and morphological; it substituted an analysis of processes for classification of the qualities of things.' In this Heracleitos-phrase began the technical use of the twin terms, φύσις and νόμος; 'in their primitive sense they denote nothing else than precisely such natural processes in themselves, on the one hand, and man's formulation of such processes, on the other.' The italics are our own. Here is a sentence to brood over, and such sentences abound.

With Prof. Myres the hunt is always up, and if we want to catch his game we must hunt with him, and hunt hard. Prof. Murray labours for us long and strenuously, and gives us garnered sheaves, gives them so quietly

and simply that we may well forget the toil they cost. He takes kindly to Anthropology; it allows him a humorous touch on things apt to be canonical and pompous. Under this touch Hesiod's confused and laboured theogonies and orthodoxies grow human, even thrilling. Hesiod's 'κράτος τε βία τε' are to most of us dreary abstractions. Who but Prof. Murray (p. 74) would have seen behind them the *mana* of the medicine-king, that power at once tricky and tremendous.¹ 'There he is,' that medicine-king, 'the visible doer of all those things which later races have delegated to higher and more shadowy beings, walking palpably before you with his medicine and perhaps his pipe, his grand manner, his fits, and his terrific dress.' As to this matter, Prof. Murray lets drop at the end of his essay a tentative sentence that might well be expanded into a book, 'I suspect that the contrast between these medicine-chiefs and the Homeric gods is one of the cardinal differences between Hellenic and pre-Hellenic religion.'

We congratulate Oxford on a brilliant success. A book so vivid must needs be fruitful. Dry-as-dust himself, if he attended these lectures, must have given himself a shake and felt for the nonce—less dusty.

J. E. HARRISON.

¹ Prof. Murray's case for κεραυνός as the thunder-stone swallowed by Kronos is strengthened by the Hesiodic fragment preserved by Chrysippos (ap. Galen *de dogmat.* Hippocr. iii. 8, p. 320). Zeus is about to swallow Metis.

συμμάρψας δ', ὃ γε χερσὶν ἔην ἐγκάτθετο νηδὺν
δεύσας μὴ τέξῃ κρατερώτερον ἄλλο κεραυνοῦ.

Cf. Soph. Oed. Rex, 200,

ὦ τῶν πυρφόρων | ἀστραπῶν κράτη νέμων,

and finally Cornutus 10, p. 10, 13, τὸ δὲ κράτος ὃ ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ χειρὶ κατέχει, where κράτος = κεραυνός: see Usener, *Rhein. Mus.* 1901, p. 174.

THE LATELY DISCOVERED FRAGMENTS OF MENANDER.

The Lately Discovered Fragments of Menander.

Edited with English Versions, Revised Text, and Critical and Explanatory Notes by UNUS MULTORUM. Oxford: James Parker, 1909.

THIS, seemingly the latest edition of the newly found fragments of Menander, ought, we think, to be hailed by Englishmen as a very substantial contribution to the literature, already considerable, of the subject. The editor, Lord Harberton, as is no secret, though his actual name is disguised under the enigmatic title *Unus Multorum*, is well known to Greek scholars by his volume of epigrams from the Greek Anthology, published by Mr. James Parker several years ago. Of the emendations and suggestions there offered, Stadtmüller, the lamented editor of the *Anthologia Graeca* in the smaller Teubner series, has made full use, but his premature death has unhappily interrupted the progress of that really monumental work, which in richness of information as to the MSS. and the large array of critics who have contributed to the correction and elucidation of the poems, leaves little or nothing to be desired. Besides his edition of the Greek Anthology, *Unus Multorum* has also published a collection of notes on Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides.

The new fragments of Menander are in one sense disappointing. It is true that they contain portions of four distinct plays, and that large sections in each one of the four comprise long passages which are obviously continuous and only require supplementing here and there. The lacunae are sometimes very slight and not difficult to fill up. In such passages our new editor is at his best. His style of translation is easy and flowing, as free from pedantic literalness as from unscholarly looseness. This it is which may fairly be called the strong point of the book.

But there are whole scenes the location of which is quite uncertain, and which have been assigned by the first editor, Lefebvre, to one play, by his successors to another. Here van Leeuwen seems to be closely

followed by Harberton, and the coincidence of the two may generally be taken as based on sound, or at least not unpalatable grounds. But it is not impossible that a fresh examination of the MS. of the new fragments may lead to different and more permanent results than either Lefebvre or van Leeuwen can claim; just as in the case of the *Peupyros* fragment Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt were able to arrive at a different arrangement of the verses by a new inspection of the MS.

In view of these uncertainties it is interesting to find *Unus Multorum* an enthusiast on the rather debateable question of the merits of the new Menandrian fragments in dramatic effectiveness and finish of style. I believe most of those who have read them confess to a feeling of disappointment, at any rate in comparison with the universal laudation accorded to Menander in antiquity. It may be said that this could not be otherwise, as even complete comedies, such as those of Terence or Plautus, abound in lines where the allusion is notwithstanding obscure; and in the new fragments of Menander, as in the earlier discovered fragments of the *Peupyros*, not one of the four plays, the *Ἐπιτρέποντες*, *Περικειρομένη*, *Σαρία*, or *Ἦπος* can be said to reveal its *argumentum*. This is particularly true in the case of the 'Woman with shorn locks' as *Unus Multorum* translates the famous comedy *περικειρομένη*. Still it is nothing remarkable to find in Lord Harberton an exception to the prevailing verdict, an exception stated with emphasis more than once, and obviously based not only on a most conscientious study of the new fragments, but on an enlarged familiarity with comedy and dramatic effect in general. So much, however, even he will not deny, that, among the finds which research has brought to light within the last twenty or thirty years, one at least, the *Mimes* of Herondas, presents views of ancient Greek life incomparably more vivid and, to most readers, far more interesting than any even of the continuous remains of the four Menandrian plays. These miniature works of mimetic art, where they have come to us un mutilated

and whole, are perfect, indeed exquisite. I would specify in particular the κοτταλος, which I do not scruple to prefer to any of the comic scenes of Menander we at present possess. It might even, we think, be said that the new fragments bring into greater prominence not a little of the *weaker* side of his plays. I, of course, mean the taking up and repeating the words of a former speaker, which is done *ad nauseam*, and must have been a common artifice (if it deserves the name) of the Menandrian dialogue. This taking up and repeating the words of the former speaker must have been as tiresome as Lessing's trick (in his prose tragedy, *Emilia Galotti*) of breaking off sentence after sentence with an interrupting —.

It remains to speak of the emendatory side of our new editor's work. He has done a good deal in this way, and I should deprecate any sweeping assertion as to his merits or defects. Perhaps his suggestions may be said to be more plausible as Greek than successful as approaching closely to the MS. tradition, or even (at times) to the probabilities of metre. The safe rule of not introducing as an emendation anything which departs violently from the ordinary metrical observances of the writer is not always kept in view. Thus in *Ἐπιτρ.* 264 the MS. gives at the end of an iambic line *τηνδε παιδηγιστην*, which the new editor corrects *τῇν σὺν παῖδα δ' ἦτις ἦν*, a rude severance of *τῇν* from *παῖδα*, to which I have not noticed any parallel in the MS. In the following line he refers in defence of *οἶσθας* as Attic to his discussion on *ῖσθας* in 156. Considerable space is there devoted to the dicta of various grammarians or lexicographers on this question, which is one of no little importance in correcting the text of many similar passages, e.g. 325 where van Leeuwen with MS. gives *οὐκ οἶδα. βουλοίμην δ' ἂν* ON. *οὐ γὰρ οἶσθά σν*; Harberton

prefers *οὐ γὰρ οἶσθας*, οἶ, which some critics will think good and forcible. In 280 where the MS. gives at the end of a line *ἡτισεσ-αβροτονον*, it may be a question whether *ἔσθ' Ἀβροτόνιον*, a diminutive found elsewhere in Menander, is not more probable than *ἔστίν, Ἀβρότονον*, though the latter reading seems to be more favoured by editors.

Metrically improbable are the following: *Epitr.* 410 *ὀνέκραγε τὴν κεφαλὴν ἅμα πατάξας σφοδρά. Περικ.* 39 *αἰτεῖ τί βούλεθ'. ὁ μὲν κατὰ σχολὴν ἐρεῖν. 114 τὴν δ' Ἀδράστειαν μάλιστα νῦν ἄρα με δεῖ προσκυνεῖν*, unless this is a misprint for *νῦν ἄρα δεῖ με προσκυνεῖν. 257 λάβη τι τούτων' οὐ γὰρ ἔωρα κέναι ποτε.*

Ingenious and at any rate notable are the following: *Epitr.* 340 *τεγατικὸν* for *τογαστικόν* of MS., and the explanation drawn from *Diog. Laertius*, 6. 61 'the woman has all the cunning of a street walker.' It is, however, a little far-fetched. *Περικ.* 337 *τυιγαροῦν ἀπάγξομαι.* But in *Samia* 18 *εἶναι τυγχάνει* the infinitival construction of *τυγχάνει* is not supported by the MS. and seems unjustifiable.

On the whole this English edition will hold its place among the similar issues of the new fragments in foreign countries. Lord Harberton does not seem to have seen the clever and original criticism of the eminent Cambridge scholar, whose loss we all deplore, Mr. Walter Headlam, although his little volume was among the earliest published on the four comedies. We are still in want of a *complete* edition, one which should embody the views and suggestions of a crowd of scholars whom the fame of Menander naturally drew to the task of explaining or supplementing the comedies immediately after their first publication by Lefebvre.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

PLAN OF ROME.

Roma prima di Sisto V.: la pianta di Roma Du Pérac-Lafréry del 1577, riprodotta dall' esemplare esistente nel Museo Britannico per cura e con introduzione di FRANCESCO EHRLÉ, d.C.d.G., Prefetto della Biblioteca Vaticana. Danesi, 1908. Sm. folio in portfolio. 70 pp. text, one folding map 1 x 0.820 m. 15 lire (12s.).

THE object of the present publication is set forth by Father Ehrle in his preface. His intention is mainly to assist historical students, 'very many of whom, in dealing with the various historical problems of the period after the Renaissance and the Reformation, often feel the necessity of clearing up some topographical question connected with the continual and extensive transformation of Rome, eternal, despite all changes.' It is by no means the first of sixteenth-century engraved plans of Rome to be reproduced; but, owing to its extreme rarity, it has hitherto escaped the attention of students. The British Museum copy is, indeed, the only known example of the original edition: of the second (of 1640) one is in Paris, another in the collection of the present writer; while a copy of the third (of 1646) was found by Father Ehrle in a private collection.

In each of the last two editions the dedication has been changed, and the plan brought, to a certain extent only, up to date, by retouching the plates so as to show the modifications which had taken place in Rome in the interval. But the original plan of 1577 is rightly considered by Father Ehrle to be the best and clearest representation that we have of Rome before the transformations that a great part of it underwent at the hands of Sixtus V., and a fac-simile reproduction of it will thus be of the greatest use to students, not only of history, but of the classical and Renaissance topography of Rome, which are so intimately connected with one another.

The introduction has an interest of its own: it is the first attempt at a coherent account of the authors of this plan and of its modifications, and of the various hands through which these and similar plates

passed, from the middle of the sixteenth century till the present day.

Both Du Pérac and Lafréry are otherwise well known to us. The former appears both as draughtsman and engraver of several plates of archaeological and architectural interest, and especially of a large plan of ancient Rome (reconstructed) dedicated to Charles IX. of France in 1574 (the plates are still in existence at the Government engraving depot in Rome¹; Father Ehrle's statement to the contrary (p. 24) rests on an error of Ovidi, *La Calcografia Romana*, Rome, 1905, p. 24), and of a very important collection of views of ancient Rome of 1575. The latter was, between 1544 and 1577 (*circa*), the most important printer and publisher of engravings in Rome, and most of Du Pérac's work was issued by him. His master appears to have been a certain Antonio Salamanca of Milan, whose activity belongs mainly to the period from 1538 to 1549, and with whom he entered into partnership in 1553, soon becoming, however, the predominant member of the firm, and largely increasing his activity. A little after 1572, indeed, he published a catalogue of his stock, which Father Ehrle reproduces in full from the unique copy preserved in the Biblioteca Marucelliana in Florence. The list contains 112 geographical and topographical engravings (maps, views of cities and fortresses and a few battles), 79 engravings of Roman antiquities, 19 important Renaissance works of art, 72 mythological and historical prints, 174 religious subjects, 26 portraits, and 20 illustrated books. The inventory of his goods, made shortly after his death in 1577, is unluckily missing, though it seems to have been in its place in the archives until a few years back.

But the catalogue in question gives a good idea of his activity and enterprise. At a date which cannot be precisely fixed, but probably towards the end of his life, he began to form a collection of his most important archaeological plates, giving to it the title of *Speculum Romanæ Magnificentiae*; but no copy of this collection has an index or an original

¹ *Catalogo delle Stampe . . . della Regia Calcografia*, No. 1439.

numbering of the plates, which are in fact differently arranged and chosen in every copy known. There are, too, very few copies to which later issues of the same plates, or plates issued for the first time by Lafréry's successors, have not been added.¹ For the plates were handed down through a series of vendors and publishers of engravings, of whom Father Ehrle gives most interesting particulars, most of whom added plates of their own, right down to the end of the eighteenth century; while, despite the fact that in 1799 the French Republican Government sent 1158 copperplates to the mint to

¹ To the earlier copies mentioned by Father Ehrle I may add one in my own collection, from the Destailleurs Library, which contains very few plates dating after the death of Lafréry, while, as it has been rebound, they may well have been added separately.

be coined into money, some of the plates exist to the present day.

There is not space to follow Father Ehrle's careful and conscientious introduction further; but it is a most important contribution to the study of a little known and fascinating subject, while the appendix contains unpublished documents and inventories bearing on it. To the present writer, who has for some time contemplated the publication of a *catalogue raisonné* of the *Speculum Romanae Magnificentiae*, this book affords an indispensable foundation for the work, and at the same time an encouragement to proceed. Father Ehrle, by continuing the publication of other important plans of Rome, will render a very great service to students.

THOMAS ASHBY.

PHAROS.

Pharos Antike, Islam, und Occident. Von HERMANN THIERSCH. Teubner.

SELDOM has even the great house of Teubner issued a more splendid and exhaustive monograph than this. The author indeed modestly tells us that on some points he is writing at second hand, and that further researches are required by specialists. That may be so, but it will be hard to find readers who will desire to go more deeply into the question of the tower industry of the whole human race. For such this volume proves to be. It is divided into three parts and an appendix of independent value. The first gives all that can be known about the great Alexandrine lighthouse, with all the Arabic information about its history till its complete ruin by earthquake in the thirteenth century. The evidence not only of writers (which is very scanty) but of coins, Pompeian wall pictures, illuminated MSS., is brought in to help the author to his reconstruction of this wonder of the world. He corrects earlier essays, especially that of Adler, and produces a consistent and splendid result in his picture of the Pharos, which was a great quadrilateral base (each side a plethron) and the height

two plethra, then an octagonal building of half that height, then a round building in the same decreasing proportion, with a fire signal of wood and pitch at the top, and probably a mirror facing seawards to intensify the light. The whole thing was about 105 metres high. The reader must consult the volume for ample details and justifications of the author's views.

Then follows a long chapter on the use made of this lighthouse by the Arabs, whose *minaret* is derived from *manara*, a fire-tower, for they established a little chapel for prayer in the topmost storey, and from this came the fashion, at least in Egypt, North Africa, and the West, of setting up minarets of a form always recalling the great original at Alexandria.

But the minaret of this kind does not include the whole genus. It appears that the earliest towers used for the call to prayer were those of Christian churches at Damascus and elsewhere in Syria, square towers from which the call to prayer was given by beating the *semantron*, or board of dry wood, which is used to-day in some of the ruder and wilder monasteries on Mount Athos.

The Mohammedans substituted the musical

call of the human voice, the Christians in due time the sound of bells.

The third part shows how the Egyptian minaret, carried all along the coast of Africa and into Spain by the Saracens, was from the great mosque of Cordova, and other such minarets, the suggestive model of Christian church towers, of which there is a whole army (as there is of minarets) reproduced in the illustrations which crowd the pages of this noble volume. In fact, only the square Norman church towers of England and the Round towers of Ireland seem to have escaped from the influence, direct or indirect, of the three superposed structures of the Pharos.

The appendix contains the author's researches in the ruins of Taposiris Magna, near Alexandria, to the west, where there are the remains of a smaller lighthouse of the same character. The present notice confines itself to a mere summary of a book full of interesting details and various learning, and refrains from any criticism which would only affect small details, and occupy more place than it is worth. The main duty of the reviewer is to recommend to all lovers of antiquity, or of the Middle Ages, either in Asia or Europe, to acquire and read this fascinating work.

J. P. MAHAFFY.

BRITISH MUSEUM MARBLES.

Greek Buildings represented by Fragments in the British Museum. By W. R. LETHABY. I. Diana's Temple at Ephesus. II. The Tomb of Mausolus. London: B. T. Batsford, 94 High Holborn, 1908. Two vols. 9½" x 6". Pp. 1-36; 37-70. 2s. net each.

PROF. LETHABY has entered the Greek field by the publication of two pamphlets each devoted to the study of a great building of which nearly all the actual stones are in the British Museum.

In each case the fragments are taken as the principal facts beyond question; what past author or explorer has woven around these facts is briefly but clearly stated and criticised with a view to a definite result; and the pamphlet closes with a description of statuary and detail.

That we should expect delightful style as well as penetration and insight in the discussion of the fragments goes without saying, but we get more; the theoretic conclusions are reached with a clearness, conciseness, almost a dryness of statement which leaves one with the impression that little more remains to be said.

A theory of reconstruction forms an important part of each study. In the case of Ephesus Prof. Lethaby begins by stating

the main facts of Wood's discovery, the work of the Austrian Institute and Mr. Hogarth's excavations, and he passes on to a criticism of Dr. Murray's reconstruction of the fragments of the later temple in the Museum, and his theory of the form of the temple from these fragments.

Without stating Dr. Murray's case, which may be seen in the Museum, we pass to Prof. Lethaby's, briefly, as follows:

(1) The temple was raised on a high platform of steps which was carried all round it, probably equidistant on all sides from the order and conditioned by the foundations which Wood discovered.

(2) The sculptured pedestals and sculptured drums were used separately as bases to columns, the former at the outer end-rows,¹ the latter at the inner end-rows and the pairs between the antae, thus giving the '36 sculptured columns' of Pliny without any duplication, and avoiding the over-drawn-out columns of the fronts with the awkward arrangement of steps behind them of the Museum restoration, not paralleled by any other example in Greek art.

(3) The temple had an 'architrave order' (so characterised by Choisy) or entablature consisting of architrave and dentil-cornice, but no frieze.

¹ Also at one return column on each flank.

To our mind there is no doubt that Prof. Lethaby's case for the reconstruction is fully proved. The result—and this is the important fact—gives us a much finer and better-proportioned temple than the one illustrated in Mr. Cromar Watt's drawing in the Museum.

In discussing the details of the Order Prof. Lethaby says (p. 19), 'With the plinth the height of the [column] base is two thirds of a diameter, a fair proportion; but without it, it is impossibly low.' It should be borne in mind that this refers only to Asiatic work. At Athens, where square members are omitted from Ionic bases, we find that those of the Erechtheum North portico, for example, are less than half a diameter in height.

There are some good remarks on the somewhat early form of the Ephesus caps (with their large egg and tongue carvings having no relation to the flutings beneath) compared to the more developed Mausoleum and Priene examples.

Dr. Murray's restoration of dentils in the raking cornice is criticised, and Priene is cited, where the raking bed-mould is less in 'depth' [height?] so as to lighten the raking cornice generally. This also would be right, aesthetically.

The few pages devoted to the sculpture are really constructive. Two fine free sketches of the sculptured drums are given shewing certain figures completed. It seems instinctively sound judgement to parallel these sculptures with the work of the Praxitelean school.

Let us hope that the suggestion for a proper setting of fragment 1239 will not fall to the ground.

In the notes on methods of workmanship there is a timely remark about the freedom of the Ephesus work. There is apparently much departure from exact symmetrical precision in the details of Greek work, and this applies even in the best Athenian buildings.

There is one remark about the overall size of the temple which does not seem quite clear. 'Pliny says that it was of the enormous and impossible size of 425 feet by 220 feet' (p. 2); but might this not refer to

the extreme sizes of the platform steps? Wood's calculation of the platform in English feet is 418' 1" by 239' 4½".

At Ephesus, our conception of the architectural scheme is nearly assured. In the case of the Mausoleum it is not so. In his second study Prof. Lethaby carefully discusses all the known restorations, on paper, of this great wonder, and then, wisely perhaps, puts forward no certain scheme of his own except a 'rejected restoration' (p. 55), one that he would like to have seen and at one time thought possible, but which he was forced to reject as lacking in simplicity. The keynote of his own conjectural reasoning may be found on p. 57, where he says 'the basis of the true design seems to be the tumulus developed, consisting of a basement, a pyramid, and a trophy. It may best be compared with the Cnidus monument; . . . The marvel must have consisted in setting over a temple-like structure a pyramid hanging high in the air.'

The general criticism of the methods of former restorers on pp. 54 and 55 is very sound, but is too long to quote here.

The method of discussing the actual form of the monument is quite admirable. It is based on a careful description of 'the evidence of the stones themselves' and thus arrives at the most original part of the study, a discovery of some certain evidence of ratio of length to width in the pyramid, and the number and spacing of the columns (pp. 45-48).

Five different restorations are illustrated and discussed. It is pointed out that these fall into two types of plan, the large plan type with a single row of surrounding columns, and the small plan type with a double row.

The small type is finally (p. 56) rejected altogether, and Adler's restoration, illustrated on p. 49, singled out as the 'best general view of the monument which has been produced.'

The arguments in favour of simplicity seem thoroughly sound. However pleasing may be Oldfield's restoration (accepted by Prof. Gardner in his *Sculptured Tombs of Hellas*) and the author's more excellent

're-
no
she
I
bee
me
his
surv
ma
of
T
full
plac
also
poin
mon
'har
and
A
trav
the
pyr
and
awa
subt
auth
join
join

Anc
U
L
THE
idea
colle
histo
Sicily
matt
'Stor
cogn
form
valua
touch
Li
are i
read

'rejected restoration,' there appears to be no real evidence for them. This is clearly shewn.

In calling attention to the use that has been repeatedly made of 'Pullan's faulty measurements,' Prof. Lethaby fully admits his own indebtedness to the admirable survey of the fragments in the Museum made by the students of the Royal College of Art, under Prof. Pite.

The penetrating remarks on the frieze do full justice to its excellence, though it is placed below the Parthenon. The remarks also about colour are very much to the point. One must conceive of these great monuments as covered with colour, but 'harmonised and softened into waxy texture and hues.'

As is here shewn, there was an 'architrave order' at the Mausoleum also. In the notes on construction we learn that the pyramid steps had rolls or fillets at the back and two ends, which would throw the water away from the actual joints, a practical subtlety which is thoroughly Greek. The author says with special regard to the mitre joints which make the work resemble marble joinery rather than masonry, 'the whole out-

look is very advanced and even doubtful'; but in the best Athenian period we see mitre joints used for marble work.

The praise of Pythios the sculptor-architect, responsible also for the temple at Priene, is well-deserved, and the quotation from Vitruvius at the close is delightful in the gravity of its large outlook.

The volumes are well illustrated by plans, line-illustrations of architectural detail, and fine suggestive sketches of carving and sculpture. They are pleasant to handle, of good paper with wide margins and large print. The proof-reading has been careful, and we came across no printer's errors. The pagination is continued straight through to facilitate future binding. Altogether these are most notable booklets, and when the series is complete¹ it should form one of the most suggestive contributions to the practical study of Greek architecture in certain aspects, that has ever been produced.

THEODORE FYFE.

¹ Since this was written, the third study of the series, on the Parthenon, has appeared. A fourth and final part will appear later.

ANCIENT ITALY.

Ancient Italy. By ETTORE PAIS. The University of Chicago Press, and Unwin, London.

The title of this work hardly conveys a just idea of its contents. It is a miscellaneous collection of papers, bearing mainly on the history of the Greek settlements in Italy, Sicily, and even Sardinia. The amount of matter which is connected with the author's 'Storia di Sicilia' is larger than that which is cognate with the 'Storia di Roma,' and the former portion appears to me to be the more valuable. But in this short notice I can only touch on one or two articles particularly.

Like all the work of Prof. Pais, these essays are interesting and even fascinating when read rapidly and uncritically. But when the

processes are probed and the results are brought face to face with the evidence, the colours often fade, and chaos takes the place of plausible coherence. The first paper on 'Ausonia and the Ausonians' seeks to show that these two titles were applied in ancient times, and properly applied, to a much larger part of the land and inhabitants of Italy than has commonly been supposed. Material is selected from the warring pronouncements of ancient writers concerning the prehistory of Italy, and is wrought into a skilful mosaic in support of the theory. The unpractised reader will not guess the extent to which the process is a 'periculosae plenum opus aleae.' The ancient writers have to be taken on trust. There is no discussion of their intrinsic value as authorities; nor any

reference to publications in which such discussion may be found. The essay requires us to believe that fragments of a genuine tradition concerning the state of Italy in times a good deal older than the Trojan war are to be found in writers from Herodotus to Lydus.

The acceptance of such a belief is often purely a result of temperament, but it is odd to find that the 'littera scripta' sometimes exercises a great fascination over Prof. Pais, of all men in the world. Curiously, even if his Ausonian theory were proved, it sheds no light on the early ethnology of Italy, because the spread of the name Ausonia is due largely to political amalgamation carried out by Morges and similar heroes.

In the essay on 'Ausonia' the writer poses as a defender of tradition. In others he returns to his more familiar and congenial rôle. An ingenious paper is that on 'Siceliot elements in the early history of Rome.' The theme is old, but the treatment shews freshness and originality. Part of the article seeks to prove that the story of the 'First Secession' is a replica of an event in the history of

Gela recorded by Herodotus (vii. 153). The democrats drove the aristocrats out, and these established themselves at a town near Gela. They were induced to return by an ancestor of Gelo the tyrant of Syracuse. Of the argument in favour of this theory, I can only say 'mole ruit sua.' Its great ingenuity cannot beguile a reader even into a momentary belief. As Prof. Pais seems to admit that the 'Second Secession' is historical, one is much surprised to find that he does not employ here what we may call his 'principle-of-all-work,' so conspicuous in the 'Storia di Roma,' and pronounce the First Secession a pale reflexion of the Second.

I ought to say that there are a number of articles in the volume which I am not competent to criticize. Also that in spite of the faults of method which I have indicated, and numerous risky details on which I cannot touch here, there are very many acute remarks on current views, and on passages in ancient writers, which will make it indispensable that the work should be consulted by those who handle in future the same topics.

J. S. R.

A THEORY OF VERSE STRUCTURE.

Homerischer Hymnenbau nebst seinen Nachahmungen bei Kallimachos, Theokrit, Vergil, Nonnos und Anderen, erschlossen von ARTHUR LUDWICH. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1908. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". xii, 380. In paper covers, 10 marks: bound, 12 marks.

THE main feature of Herr Ludwig's new book is a theory based on his discovery of 'a remarkable peculiarity in the architecture' of the *Hymn to Hermes*.

'In arranging the framework of his poem the poet has utilized the two numbers which receive special prominence in the opening lines of the hymn'; its 580 lines fall into 'pericopae' of four and ten lines respectively; this is simply another way of saying that 580 is divisible by 4 and 10, and this is all that Ludwig claims for his theory; he expressly

warns his readers not to expect a division into stanzas or strophes in which a pause in the sense corresponds with the close of each metrical group.

The 'symbolism' of the poet's arithmetic lies in his choice of the numbers 4 and 10, which are sacred to Hermes because he was born on the 4th day of the 10th month. Ludwig claims that his discovery vindicates the traditional length of the poem, and we have no right, he says, to add or take away a single verse. He gives examples of the same principle at work in many other hymns.

We do not deny the facts adduced by Ludwig; but do they mean anything? There is no doubt that the ancients occasionally constructed poems on arithmetical principles; but we are going beyond the

limits of sane criticism if we extend this *Zahlensymbolik* to any poem on the sole ground that its total number of verses is divisible by one or two simple numbers, and therefore capable of being arranged in a 'monistic' or 'dualistic' scheme of 'pericopae.' We have only to find a simple divisor in any given hymn, and we shall require but little ingenuity to endow it with a deep inner meaning.

At times the expositor finds himself called upon to choose the sacred number from a perplexing variety of divisors, as e.g. when Ludwich hesitates between 2, 3 and 3, 4 in Callim. *Zeus*; Zeus, he remarks, 'possessed no fixed holy number'; for, as King of the gods, he enjoyed 'a certain freedom' in this respect; so that 2, 3, 6, 8, 12, or 16 would have suited equally well in this poem of 96 lines. Our suspicions are still further aroused when we observe that the same numbers are symbolical in a great number of hymns addressed to different deities. Were it suddenly discovered that the *Hymn to Helios* was originally intended for the Dioscuri, Aphrodite, Selene, or several other deities, we could still maintain its arithmetical principles by changing the mystical meaning of its 'tetrads.' The number 3 is sacred to Adonis, Apollo, Zeus, Demeter, Asclepius; 4 to Hermes, Heracles, Apollo, Aphrodite, Helios, Gaia, Dioscuri, Selene. There is no undue severity in the rules of the fascinating game invented by Ludwich; gods gaily borrow one another's numbers (especially those of their near relatives), and we are occasionally allowed to expel lines from intractable hymns.

Ludwich's theory will not protect the hymns against the expurgator. If we omit from the *H. Hermes* the lines bracketed as spurious in Baumeister's edition, we get a total of $580 - 28 = 552$ lines; this we can divide into 'pericopae' of 12 and 4 lines; the former finds its justification in the sacrifice to the 12 gods (*δώδεκα μοῖραι* v. 128), and the number 4 was universally regarded by the ancients as sacred to Hermes. If the interpolated lines numbered 27, we should have a remainder of 553, giving a 'monistic' plan of 7-line 'pericopae' derived from the close connection of the god with the 7 strings

of the lyre. The assumption of a single one-line lacuna (e.g. after 109) would give a like result, $581 = 7 \times 83$. Ludwich's own interpretation of the poem is open to serious objections; vv. 11-12, 17-19 and the archaeological footnotes in 25, 111 are rightly regarded by many critics as interpolations. There can be no significance whatever in *δέκατος μείς* (v. 11); the birth of a child at that date was not 'an unusual occurrence,' as Ludwich calls it, but quite in accordance with the ancient method of reckoning. In Herod. vi. 63 a child's legitimacy is seriously impugned because the mother *οὐ πληρώσασα τοὺς δέκα μῆνας* τίκτει, and an *ἐννεάμην* child is declared to be exceptional (*ib.* 69). Further, Hermes was born *τετράδι τῇ προτέρῃ*, and Ludwich is wrong in his statement: 'volle zehn Monate lang trägt die Mutter das Kind unter ihrem Herzen.' It was but a few days over nine months.

The *Hymn to Pan* consists of 49 lines, a 'monistic' system of 'pericopae' in 7 lines. Like Apollo and Hermes, Pan was devoted to music; some even regarded him as the son of Apollo; accordingly 'the hieratic number of Pan was the same as that of Apollo, viz. 7.' Had the poem contained 51 (3×17) we should then have had a 'monistic' scheme based on 3, which was sacred to Apollo 'because with his sister and mother he formed a triad.' Supposing the number of verses to have been 48, the poem would be based on 3 and 4, and 4 was also sacred to Apollo. A total of 50 would give a 'dualistic' scheme with 10 and 5, the former borrowed from Pan's friend Hermes, and the latter of course representing the trinity Apollo, Zeus and Artemis, with the two musical gods Hermes and Pan. There is therefore no particular significance in the number 49; any figure from 48 to 52 inclusive would have suited just as well.

Ludwich finds the same principle at work in Latin poetry, and he gives several examples from the *Eclogues*. The reader can easily find for himself innumerable instances from the religious and secular poetry of every race and age. The following are in accordance with the canons laid down by the German scholar.

Catullus xxxiv. 24 lines to Diana; mystic numbers, 4 and 3, the sacred numbers of Apollo and Zeus, her father and brother; a 'triadic-tetradic' scheme like Callim. *Zeus*.

Catullus xxxvi. 20 lines; mystic numbers, 4 sacred to Venus (*Veneri Cupidinique*), and 5 representing Cupid as a member of the quintet Venus, Mars and their three children.

From English Literature the following case will suffice: Book I. of *Paradise Lost* contains 798 lines, divisible by the sacred numbers 3 and 7, the former denoting the Holy Trinity, the latter representing the Divine Perfection. English, Welsh and

German hymnology will also supply many striking parallels.

The very universality of the phenomenon discovered by Ludwich affords the strongest argument against its mystic significance; there will always be many poems the totals of which can be divided by 3, 4, or 5; and by the assumption if necessary of a single-line lacuna or interpolation we can include all the rest (now divisible by 2) in a 'monistic' scheme of 'dyads' like that suggested by Ludwich for the short *Homeric Hymn to Zeus*.

T. HUDSON WILLIAMS.

University College of N. Wales, Bangor.

WALTERS' AND CONWAY'S *LIMEN*.

Limen, a First Latin Book. By W. C. FLAMSTEAD WALTERS, M.A., Professor of Classical Literature in King's College, London, and R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., Professor of Latin in the University of Manchester. London: Murray, 1908. Pp. xxii + 376. 2s. 6d.

ELEMENTARY books in dead languages would be much better, and far fewer, if the difficulty and importance of their proper construction were more generally understood. The tact and experience of the practical teacher must meet the knowledge and insight of the finished scholar and together execute what differs little from an educational sword dance. How often the first has to say, 'You cannot teach *this*; it is abstruse'; and the second, 'You must not teach *that*; it is wrong.' The path of reconciliation is not easy to discover, but the well-known position and qualifications of the joint authors of *Limen* warrant us in the expectation that they will find it. The object of the book is to provide 'the grammatical staple of a three year course for boys who begin Latin when they are about eleven years old,' and its contents embrace grammar (accidence and syntax), reading lessons, questions upon them, and exercises with conversations. Whether the result, to produce which no

small pains and care have been expended, has the prime merit of being a 'teachable' book, I do not venture to determine, remembering what a schoolmaster once said to me, that it was rash to call a book 'teachable' till you had taught from it for at least a single term. But so much is clear at once that in its handling of the various topics *Limen* is not only rational and methodical but lucid and stimulating.

It will be interesting to consider how its authors approach the chief problems of elementary Latin teaching. One of these is the question, what part should philology be allowed to play in the exposition of the accidence and the explanation of the syntax? It is, I suppose, generally recognised that analysis cannot be altogether excluded from the presentation of declensions and conjugations, that the mind will of itself discern the difference between the ending of a word which changes in the individual but is permanent in the type, and its beginning, in which just the opposite is the case, and that it may as well be helped in the process. But how far should we go in this direction? Shall we adopt the thoroughgoing etymological analysis which, if I mistake not, Dr. Fennell was the first to introduce into an English school-book, and teach the division by 'stem' and 'suffix,' as

terra-m, porta-t? Or shall we divide by 'base' and 'ending' as *terr-am, port-at*, as in the *New Latin Primer* and Atkinson's and Pearce's *First Latin Book*. The former, to which the authors evidently incline, is the more strictly scientific; but it is apt to induce perplexities which we cannot remove, or remove only by explanations either uncertain in themselves or not readily comprehended by beginners. Inconsistencies too are inevitable. Take the declension of *dīz* (§ 107). There you have *dīz-s, dīz-m, dīz-i* (G. D.), but *dīz* (Abl.), and in a note *dīz* is given as another form of the Gen. and Dat. The anomalies thus forced upon our notice retire into the background if the common coalescence of formative with inflexional suffix is recognised by the division *dī-ēs, -em, -ē ē*. With a good tutor, this matter is of no very great importance; and speaking generally the use of etymological explanation in *Limen* is sparing and judicious. Some of the suggestions are new or at least not hackneyed. *dē* 'concerning' is compared to the English, 'to preach from a text.' *sicut(i)*, derived from *si-cut(i)*, 'so, as' (not from *sic-ut(i)*), is used to explain the well-known anomalies *ut, ubi*, etc.; these have arisen from a misunderstanding of the compounds *si-cut, si-cubi*, etc., whose first element was supposed to be *sic*; *inpero* is from *in paro* 'to make ready (put) a burden on a person.' (So substantially Vaniček and Walde.)

Another question for the teacher of Latin is how should he deal with the numerous correspondences in the vocabularies of English and Latin. Should he draw attention to them in order to smooth, as he thinks, the path of Latin beginners? Or pass them over as being on the whole rather a hindrance than a help to progress? Or again utilise them to throw light on the meaning of the rarer English words which are derived from Latin? The last proceeding has its utility, but it belongs rather to the teaching of English than Latin, and in a Latin text-book should have been relegated to the index. On the other hand the authors are to be congratulated on the way they treat the English representative of a Latin word which has ceased to be its equivalent. No fault of our Latin dictionaries is more

mischievous than the intrusion into translations of such transliterations as *compensate, subtle*, and so forth. The authors see this clearly, as a single page will show. There (170) the vocabulary gives *excitare, propagare, doctrina, hereditas, pius, subiectus*, all with English translations from which *excite, propagate, doctrine, heredity, pious and subject*, are every one of them excluded. Some may think that strictness has been carried too far, but not those who have had much to do with looking over Latin composition. Upon the true correspondences there is little to say. All I have noted is that the authors might more frequently have called attention to the English derivations from the 'supine' stems of third conjugation verbs.

I now come to syntax. In spite of, and perhaps also because of, German and American activity, much in Latin syntactical theory is still in an unsatisfactory state; and all that we can demand from a first manual is that it shall be clear, concise, and as accurate as can be expected from an account that extends over some two centuries of shifting usage and embraces a multitude of details. Little fault can be found with the authors here. No new terminological 'exactitudes' have been introduced, unless we count 'patient,' for the subject of a passive verb; and the origin of constructions is explained where it is safe and illuminating to do so, though I rather doubt the advisability of importing Brugmann's explanation of the *-dō* suffix into the interpretation of the gerundive. The different types of the conditional statement receive arresting descriptions; the Open-question type, the Might-have-been type, and the Might-yet-be type. *Oratio obliqua* is treated more adequately than in most English and American grammars; but the statement that rhetorical questions, the answer to which is *not* known or clearly foreshadowed, are put into the subjunctive, is insufficient. Such questions, if a first or second person is concerned, are normally put into the infinitive.

Great pains have been spent on the reading lessons, and those in continuous narrative are written in pure and idiomatic Latin. The 'copy-book jargon' of so many

elementary books is wholly absent. The conversations are not in all cases so successful. The Latin sometimes seems stiff and unnatural; e.g. on p. 31, would the boy have called out, 'O Iuppiter, remus in aquam cadit,' and not rather, 'remum uide: cadit in aquam,' or else 'cadit remus in aquam'? Lively and unstudied Latin conversation is certainly not easy to produce: but our teachers must learn to produce it if the oral method is to succeed, and without the oral method the position of Latin will, I fear,

remain precarious. I could descant upon this topic, but I must content myself with a single word of warning, though not one that Professors Walters and Conway need. Latin conversation is a most useful adjunct to elementary teaching, but it must be confined to the regions—the sufficiently ample regions—which English and Latin hold in common. Outside these limits it is apt to be mere artifice and sham.

J. P. POSTGATE.

SHORT NOTICES

A Century of Archaeological Discoveries. By ADOLF MICHAELIS. Translated by BETTINA KAHNWEILER. With a preface by Prof. PERCY GARDNER. 9" × 5½". Pp. xxii + 366. With 26 plates. London: John Murray, 1908. 12s.

THE ordinary reader might expect this book to be a somewhat dry record, but he, and still more the specialist, will find it alive with interest and fascination. Professor Michaelis does not limit himself to Greece and Rome, nor does he only discuss the work of the excavator; and he has certainly added to the value of the book by incorporating the chief results of critical research in such subjects as Greek sculpture and vase painting. The story of the Elgin Marbles and of the provoking misfortune by which those of Aegina were lost to the British Museum, is in particular of great interest to us. Much of his chronicle is doubtless familiar from other works on the same lines, such as those of Schuchhardt, Percy Gardner, and Diehls, but many records of less known yet important discoveries are included. An apparent tendency to ignore the recent labours of British archaeologists may be noticed, such as the work done in Cyprus and Melos, which publications have now rendered accessible to foreign scholars; these may be more familiar to English readers, and on that account less missed, but they might still have been incorporated in the useful chronological

table at the end of the book. Bibliographical references might with advantage have been added throughout or in a concise table at the end. We note a few odd misprints, such as 'Cerveteri' on p. 70; on p. 91 'the lioness . . . although her hind-quarters are already paralysed, lifts his (*sic*) head'; in the chronological table, 'Katalog' (1854); 'Kleimasien' (1903); and the title of Prof. Strzygowski's work (1901) is not 'Rome oder Orient' but 'Orient oder Rom.'

H. B. W.

Douris and the Painters of Greek Vases. By EDMOND POTTIER. Translated by BETTINA KAHNWEILER. With a preface by JANE ELLEN HARRISON. 9" × 5½". Pp. xvi + 92. 25 plates. London: John Murray, 1909. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

THE original of this work has already been noticed in these pages (*C.R.* 1905, p. 377). M. Pottier's charming and lucid style loses nothing by its re-appearance in English form; his illustrations are all reproduced, and the only important difference is the increase in price from 3 fr. 50 to 7s. 6d., due to the fact that the plates now appear in colour. Of the latter change one unfortunate result is that Fig. 5 appears as a vase-painting drawn *in outline* on red ground! Miss Harrison contributes a characteristic preface.

H. B. W.

*Die Bestimmung des Onos oder Epinetron.*By Dr. MARGARETE LÁNG. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ".

Pp. viii + 70. 23 illustrations. Berlin: Weidmann, 1908. Mk. 2 40 pf.

THE chief interest of Dr. Margarete Láng's brochure is that it is an attempt to deal with the curious implement known as the *onos* or *ἐπινητρον* from the practical feminine point of view. It was apparently used for more than one purpose (Hesychius says that it was used for smoothing the thread for spinning), but was always placed on the knee, as depicted in vase-paintings. Probably it was of wood, a more practical material, the terracotta examples which we possess being either votive offerings (e.g. those found on the Athenian Acropolis), or wedding presents, afterwards placed in tombs.

H. B. W.

Πορφύριον Ἀφορμαὶ πρὸς τὰ νοητά. Recensuit B. MOMMERT. Teubner, 1907. Pp. xxxiii + 56.

THIS is a carefully edited text of Porphyry's 'sententiae,' by a scholar whose name is not familiar to us. The 'praefatio' contains a lucid account of the manuscript upon which, together with Stobaeus, the text is based, and also, amongst other matters, a discussion of the title and design of the work. The work is designed,—so the editor concludes,—to serve as an introduction to philosophy, and its proper title is *ἀφορμαί*, not *ὑπομνήματα*, *κεφάλαια* or *ἐπιχειρήματα*. Under the text are printed, first, the parallels from or references to the philosophic sources (mainly Plotinus), and, at the foot, the critical notes. In the constitution of the text the editor is indebted for many useful emendations to Mr. G. Kroll, to whom the book is dedicated.

R. G. B.

Silanus the Christian. By E. A. ABBOTT, D.D. London: A. & C. Black. Pp. 368.

THE doctrinal standpoint of the author of *Philochristus* is well known to students who interest themselves in theological questions. For the benefit of non-theological readers we may say that this doctrinal standpoint is, briefly: 'Non-miraculous Christianity.' Some would reply that this is impossible; and to these Dr. Abbott offers the present book by way of disproving their contention.

Naturally, such a book is in the highest degree contentious, though written with all Dr. Abbott's skill and tact. The book is in the form of a 'story'; but the story-telling part of it is very thin—little more than a background for the exposition of the writer's own views. No detailed proofs are given; these must be looked for in the supplementary volume of 'Notes.'

From the point of view of the classical reader, pure and simple, not the least interesting parts of *Silanus* are the sections devoted to Epicurus and his system.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

The King's School, Ely.

M. Manilii Astronomica. Edidit THEODORUS BREITER. Pars II. Commentary.

THE first part of this work (the text only) I reviewed in the *Classical Quarterly*, ii. 2. 123 sqq., and I was able to speak of it in terms of commendation such as I am unable to give to the present volume. Breiter has been writing upon Manilius for more than half a century; but this Commentary is not worthy of his reputation. It leaves the reader under the impression that the editor has a real knowledge of Manilius, but little or no gift of exposition. Nor can I escape the suspicion that the work has been executed with haste: if B. had not been working so long upon Man. I should say it had been 'scamped.' Difficulties of reading are not discussed. *Certain* emendations are not even noticed. Interpretations other than Breiter's are wholly neglected. No attempt is made to illustrate or explain the Latin of M. And I marvel for what class of reader this work is intended. The *κακοῦθες* of 'Quellenforschung' is everywhere apparent; and again and again B. obscures a difficult issue by seeking to interpret M. from every source save M. himself.

Nor are the faults of this Commentary merely negative. The number of really bad mistakes in it is startling. I select two for special notice: 2. 489 'consilium ipse suum est' is interpreted by B. as = 'amat se.' This is impossible not only as Latin but also as astrology; moreover, no previous commentator has ever made a mistake as to the meaning here. 4. 750-1 'laxo Persis amictu, uestibus ipsa suis haerens': B. interprets this to mean that the Persians wear loose outer garments and tight underclothing. Whence he derives his knowledge of Persian underclothing I do not know; but all that Manilius says is that the Persians are *bracati* (as Ovid, *Trist.* 10. 34 'pro patrio cultu Persica braca tegit'), and that their *bracae* are of wool, i.e. 'haerens = haerens Arieti ('belonging to Aries,' as 2. 443 'Mauorti haeret') qui laniger est.' Aries is *laniger*, and Persia belongs to him even in its garments: *uestibus* is ablative. Other mistakes I might notice of a like kind.

I am sorry not to be able to speak with greater respect of this book; for Breiter has in the past deserved well of Manilius. But I have had this

Commentary in my hands every day for four months, together with other works upon Manilius, and I cannot see that it advances the study of its subject.

H. W. GARROD.

M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes: Divinatio in Q. Caecilium; in C. Verrem recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit GULIELMUS PETERSON.
Oxford: Clarendon Press, n.d.

READERS of this journal will be familiar with the critical principles of Principal Peterson. In his Preface he refers amongst other articles to *C.R.* vol. xvi. pp. 401-406, and vol. xvii. pp. 162-164. No one who has given serious attention to the subject can doubt that he has established one contention at any rate, viz. that the excellent Cluny manuscript No. 498 is identical with that used by P. Nanninck in 1548, and by Franz Schmidt († 1573), and owned by Jean Matal (1520-1597), and that the first hand in *Lg.* 42 is in wonderful accord with it as a rule. The editor's work and that of Mr. A. C. Clark have undoubtedly laid more securely and scientifically than ever before the foundations for a trustworthy text, which will not be widely different from what Cicero actually wrote. The reviving interest in Petrarch's age is bearing fruit. Only there remains, and probably will long remain, room for difference of opinion, due to the character of editors—to the personal equation. Professor Peterson's can be estimated by one or two examples—all that there is room for in this notice.

In II. i. § 41 we have 'idem iste . . . idem in Cn. Dolabellam qui in C. Carbonem fuit. Nam quae in ipsum valebant crimina contulit in illum, causamque illius omnem ad inimicos accusatoresque detulit; ipse in eum cui legatus, cui pro quaestore fuit, inimicissimum atque improbissimum testimonium dixit. Ille miser cum esset Cn. Dolabella,—cum proditione istius nefaria, tum improbo ac falso eiusdem testimonio,—tum multo ex maxima parte istius furtorum ac flagitiorum invidia conflagravit.' The critical note runs, 'Cn. Dolabella *del. Naugerius, Jord., Kays.: malim* Ille miser (i. § 74) cum esset *conflictatus*, cum etc.' The interjectional use of *miser* is, of course, common; but it is an 'idol' to expect an author continually to use the same turns of expression. Here *miser* may very well be taken predicatively, 'to be pitied both for Verres' abominable treachery and for his shameless false evidence against him.'

In II. 4 § 26 all the MSS. give 'Vestrane urbs electa est ad quam cum adirent ex Italia crucem civis Romani prius quam quemquam amicum populi Romani viderent?' except that Harl. 4852 has *cives Romani*. The editor inserts *cives* before *crucem* (cf. *C.R.* xviii. 210). Mueller added *quicumque* before *adirent*. But for the plural used without a subject expressed, cf. 2 Phil. § 105 *Casino salutatum veniebant, Aquino, Interamna*.

On the other hand, in II. 4 § 20, 'Res publica detrimentum fecit quod per te imperi ius in una civitate imminutum est: Siculi, quod ipsum non de summa frumenti detractum, sed translatum in Centuripinos. . . . et hoc plus impositum quam ferre possent,' the editor rightly keeps *quod ipsum* of RS. (*quod hoc p8*), and rejects the specious *quod id ipsum* of Richter. Similarly the passage in § 22 about the condemnation of C. Cato, the consul of 114 B.C., he very properly retains as authentic, merely adopting Rossbach's improvement of the punctuation. That Velleius ii. 8 is not the source of an interpolation, but is drawn from Cicero, is undoubtedly the correct view.

Lastly, to take a point of spelling. It is often taken for granted by editors that an author would not avail himself of two forms of a word, although the example of English writers might have shown that, for euphony even, an elegant or scholarly taste will sometimes vary the form of a word. In II. 4 § 1, we have (according to RSHp) in *Sicilia tota, tam locupleti, tam vetere provincia* (δ alone have *locuplete*). In § 29 RS give a *Phylarcho Centuripino, homine locuplete ac nobili* (δ 'ut semper' *locuplete*). In § 46 *L. Papinio, viro primario, locupleti honestoque equite Romano*, with no variant noted. The editor reads *locupleti* in all cases. It is sounder to follow the evidence of RS and to look for an explanation of the variation. Cicero appears to use *locupleti*, except when that form would give an unmusical iteration of *i*-sounds, when he substitutes *locuplete*, as in § 29, because of *nobili*.

These instances should suffice to give the reader an understanding of the editor's manner of working. His text is as little open to serious cavil as any probably could be, that could be constituted to-day, and his *apparatus criticus* is a solid contribution to knowledge, whether a reader disagrees in any case with his inferences from it or not.

T. NICKLIN.

Rossall, Fleetwood.

VERSIONS

He first deceased; she for a little tried
To live without him, liked it not and died.

SIR HENRY WOTTON.

ᾠχελ' ὁ μὲν πρότερος· βαῖδν χρόνον ᾗδ' ἀτὲρ
ἀνδρὸς
τλᾶσα βίον τρίβειν ᾗχθετο κἀπέθανεν.

E. D. STONE.

THERE are not words enough in all Shakespeare to express the merest fraction of a man's experience in an hour. The speed of the eyesight and the hearing, and the continual industry of the mind, produce in ten minutes what it would require a laborious volume to shadow forth by comparisons and round about approaches. If verbal logic were sufficient, life would be as plain sailing as a piece of Euclid. But as a matter of fact we make a travesty of the simplest process of thought when we put it into words; for the words are all coloured and forsworn, apply inaccurately, and bring with them, from former uses, ideas of praise and blame that have nothing to do with the question in hand. So we must always see to it nearly, that we judge by the realities of life and not by the partial terms that represent them in man's speech; and at times of choice we must leave words upon one side, and act upon those brute convictions, unexpressed and perhaps inexpressible, which cannot be flourished in an argument, but which are truly the sum and fruit of our experience. Words are for communication, not for judgment.

R. L. STEVENSON: *Walt Whitman*.

Ὅσα γὰρ καὶ βραχ' ὅς τις μέρους μιᾶς ἡμέρας πάσχει τε καὶ πράττει, πῶς ἂν καὶ πᾶσι τοῦ Ὁμήρου λόγους χρώμενος οὐχ ὅπως πάντα ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλοσὶν ἂν μόριον διεξίη; τοσαύτῃ γὰρ ταχυτῇτι βλέποντι καὶ ἀκούοντι οἱ ἄνθρωποι καὶ οὕτω συνεχῶς τῷ νῷ χρώνται, ὥστε εἰ τις βούλοιο καὶ ὥσπερ ἐν σκιαγραφίᾳ μέρει μόνον ἀποδείξαι, μεγίστη ἂν τῇ βίβλῳ καὶ πλείστῳ τῷ πόνῳ χρώμενον δεῖν συγγράφειν, καὶ τοῦτο σκολιῶς πως καὶ ἐκ παραβολῆς ἀπτόμενον τοῦ πράγματος. εἰ γὰρ ἱκανὸν ἦν ἡμῖν τὸ τῶν λόγων ἀκριβές, τί ἂν χαλεπώτερον συνιέναι βουλομένοις ἐδόκει τὸ ζῆν ἢ τὰ τῶν γεωμετρῶν προβλήματα; ἀλλὰ κομφοδοῦσι γὰρ καὶ οὐ συγγράφουσιν οἱ καὶ τὰ ἀπλούστατα τῆς νοήσεως ἐπεξίεναι πειρώμενοι· κίβδηλοι γὰρ αὐτοῖς καὶ παράσθηται οἱ λόγοι καὶ οὐ δι' ἀκριβείας ἐπικεῖνται, ἅτε διὰ τὸ τοσαντάκις πρότερον ῥηθῆναι ἐπαινόν τινα καὶ ψόγον ἀλλότριον ἐσθημαίνοντες. ὥστε πᾶσι σκεπτέον τόδε, ὅπως τοῖς οὖσι τοῦ βίου τεκμαιρόμενοι μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐνδεῶς ἀναφαίνουσι λόγοις κρινούσιν ἃ αἰσθάνονται· καὶ ὅταν δέη δυοῖν θάτερον προαιρεῖσθαι, τοὺς λόγους ἀπολιπόντας τὰ τῆς γνώμης τὰ ἄλογα καὶ ἄρρητα καὶ ἔστιν ἃ λέγεσθαι οὐδὰμῶς ἐνδέχομενα, τῷ δὲ ὄντι ἀκμῇ τις ἡμῖν ἐστὶ καὶ καρπὸς τῶν κατὰ τὸν βίον παθῶν,—πρὸς ταῦτα χρῆ ἀποβλέποντας προαιρεῖσθαι. διὰ γὰρ τῶν λόγων κοινούσθαι προσήκει ἡμῖν, ἀλλ' οὐ κρίνειν.

J. M. EDMONDS.

ARCHAEOLOGY

MONTHLY RECORD.

SOUTH RUSSIA.

Batum.—An exceptionally rich find of jewellery, of which all the pieces were acquired by the Russian Government, occurred here last year. A portrait of the Emperor Lucius Verus is an example of rare technique, being cut *intaglio* in a rock-crystal gem, which is then backed with gold foil, so as to give the effect of a relief in gold under the crystal surface. This kind of work was revived in the period of the Italian renaissance, and many crystal plaques of that date are extant, which were originally used in the decoration of caskets; but the gold backing of these has mostly perished. This Roman gem, which is of the finest workmanship, is set in a gold frame and mounted as a shoulder brooch. Other notable objects

were a silver bowl ornamented with an embossed figure of Fortune, and a necklace of gold beads which are curiously like some designs of the Minoan period.

Panticapaion.—The excavation of the cemetery has been continued. Among the finds were a stone sarcophagus with a lid in the shape of a gabled roof, a sepulchral chamber with painted walls,—barbarous motives, birds, figures with symbolical attributes, in blue and red, and a long series of gravestones. Most of these were adorned with sculpture in relief: horsemen and youths armed in the Scythian fashion, seated ladies with their maids, and other familiar types; and many were found with painted decoration, fillets and garlands, usually in red. There were remains of colour also on the reliefs. The inscriptions, which give the date to the stones, are mostly of Roman

period; but several go back to the fourth century B.C. One of the monuments is recognised as having been in the museum of Kertch at the time of the Crimean War, when the building was destroyed and its contents dispersed. There were also the usual large finds of gems and gold jewellery, a few archaic and later terra-cottas, bronze and iron ornaments and utensils, and pottery of all kinds—little Corinthian jars, Attic black- and red-figure ware, including a quantity of the miniature children's *lecythoi* decorated with palmettes, heads, and figures of geese and ducks, and plain black-varnished and moulded ware. One of these last fragments bears a *graffito* inscription: *λεπὸς Διὸς φιλον*, which is of interest as being the first evidence of the cult of Zeus Philios at Panticafaion.

Excavations were resumed in the tumulus of Blitnitya, which was partly explored in 1882. Near the centre were discovered five skeletons of horses, their heads turned towards the grave which was first opened. Near them were the bits and remains of harness; the bronze and silver trappings, unfortunately not well preserved, were decorated with relief, heads of Medusa and other designs. There were also strings of glass and bone beads.¹

AFRICA.

Mahdia.—The bronzes which were found in the sea off Mahdia have now been bought and cleaned. The little statuette of Eros is seen to have been adapted for a lamp, the head and bust forming the reservoir, while the torch which he holds was the burner. The large terminal figure of Dionysos has been found to bear the sculptor's signature, ΒΟΗΘΟΣ·ΚΑΛΛΗΔΟΝΙΟΣ·ΕΠΟΙΕΙ. This inscription is a final confirmation of the conjecture that Boethos was a native not of Carthage, as was formerly supposed, but of Chalcedon in Macedonia. The style of the hair and beard of this figure and the dignity of the features are true to the fifth century manner of the original; but the free treatment of the fillets with which the head is wreathed is thought to be an innovation of the copyist.²

An attempt has also been made, with considerable success, to recover more of the shipwrecked cargo by means of divers. The funds for this purpose were provided by the French Academy. There was great difficulty in finding the place at which the sponge-fishers had drawn up the first pieces; but at last a mass of marble columns was discovered, tightly packed in rows and converging towards the bows of the boat, which must have been more than ninety feet long and about twenty-four feet in beam. Between the columns were other architectural members, including capitals of the Ionic and Corinthian orders. Many fragments of pottery were found, and one whole vessel, a storage amphora nearly three feet high. The only works of art which appeared were

fragments of the large marble craters, sculptured with reliefs, which were common in the Graeco-Roman period. The best of them is almost a duplicate of the Borghese Vase, which is now in the Louvre. The subject is a Bacchic revel; the figures preserved on these fragments are Dionysos, leaning on the shoulder of a young girl who is playing on a lyre, and a dancing Satyr. The exploration of these remains is to be continued, and other valuable discoveries may be made.³

Bulla Regia.—The excavation of the sanctuary of Apollo has yielded an important series of statues. The building itself, like many of the African shrines, which were largely influenced by Punic cults, consisted of an open courtyard surrounded on three sides by a colonnade, and three small chambers opening from the further wall of this precinct. In the central chamber, which bore over the doorway a votive inscription—*Deo patrio Apollini et Diis Augustis*—was a colossal statue of Apollo with the lyre, a variant, apparently an earlier version, of the type represented in the Apollo which was discovered at Cyrene by Lieutenants Smith and Porcher, and is now in the British Museum. The lyre is adorned with a relief: Marsyas, and the Scythian slave sharpening the knife to slay him. In front of the base of this statue is a triangular pedestal on which a tripod stood, and in niches on either side of the Apollo two more statues, Aesculapius and Ceres. In this group of deities, as in the form of the shrine, there seems to be evidence of the Punic religion; Apollo is Baal, Ceres Tanit, and Aesculapius Eschmun. Some of the other statues, found in the two side chambers and the colonnade, show the curious fusion of attributes which was common in Africa in Roman times: Athena, winged, wearing a mural crown over her helmet, and holding a cornucopia, is identified as Athena-Polias-Tyche-Nike; and a figure of Saturn similarly holds the cornucopia and wears the mural crown. There is another statue of Athena with wind-blown drapery in the manner of the Victory and Nereid types of the fifth century. The head of the figure is missing. A Roman in civilian dress of the time of Trajan has been converted for use at a later period; it bears an inscription of the fourth century A.D. and a beard has been engraved on the face in the later style. The statue of Minia Procula, also of Trajan's time, was probably re-used in the same way when the shrine was rebuilt under Marcus Aurelius.

Kairuan.—An inscription from the recently excavated Temple of Saturn contains an allusion which has not yet been explained: *Pro salute Publii nostri et Passeni . . . liberorumque eorum . . . dealbavit petram Saturni*.⁴

FRANCE.

Narbonne.—A tombstone which was recently discovered in the old ramparts and is shown by the material to be of local workmanship, bears a curious

¹ *Arch. Anzeiger*, 1908, pp. 159 sq.

² *C.R. Acad. Inscr.*, 1908, pp. 386-7.

³ *Ibidem*, pp. 532 sq.

⁴ *Arch. Anzeiger*, 1908, pp. 213 sq.

relief and an inscription. The field of the relief is divided by a partition, on one side is a corn-mill of the usual type, turned by a mule whose eyes are blindfolded, and on the other side a dog, wearing a collar from which a bell is hung, with a small altar in the background. The inscription reads:

M · CAREIVS · M · L · ASISABISIO · VIVOS ·
SIBI · FECIT · ET · CAREIE · NIGELLAE ·
ET · CAREIEÆ · M · F · TERTIÆ · ANNOR ·
VI.

MATER · CVM · GNATA · IACEO · MISERABILE ·
FATO
QVAS · PVRA · ET · VNA · DIES · DETVLT · AD ·
CINERES.

The name Careieus is of frequent occurrence in the district, but the cognomen is unique.

Alise-Sainte-Reine.—In recent excavations a bronze vase was found with the votive inscription: DEO · VCVETI · ET · BERGVSIÆ · REMVS · PRIMI · FIL · DONAVIT · V · S · L · M.

This is of value, as it establishes the sex of Ucuētis, who, since his first discovery in a Gaulish inscription seventy years ago, has been taken for a goddess. It also introduces for the first time his female colleague, Bergusia. Such pairs of deities appear very commonly in Gaul.¹

¹ *C. R. Acad. Inscr.*, 1908, pp. 496 sq.

NEWS AND COMMENTS

THE second open meeting of the British School of Rome for the present season was held in the Library of the School on Friday, March 12th.

The Director read a paper by Dr. Duncan Mackenzie, illustrated by lantern slides, on the results of his recent journey to Sardinia, in which he was accompanied by the Director and by Mr. F. C. Newton as architect. Among the most important monuments discovered were several dolmens—one close to the already known dolmen at Birori, in the centre of the island, which had hitherto been believed to be the only one still existing in the island in a good state of preservation; another, near the village of Austis (which had afterwards been elongated, one end having been removed, thus forming a transition between the dolmens and the longer cellae of the tombs of the giants), and two others of an advanced type, one with a cover-slab measuring over 4 yards by 3. Another tomb was partly cut in the rock and partly built, with a characteristic dolmen coverslab.

Another interesting class of monuments is formed by some tombs of the giants, somewhat shorter than the usual type, with a curved façade built of several courses of masonry: a small square hole communicated with the interior of the tomb. The whole of the tomb mound was covered with polygonal masonry of large slabs. In another case the characteristic round-headed headstone and façade of the tomb of the giants was imitated in a vertically cut face of rock, the cella being

cut in the rock itself. Another building already noticed by Sig. Nissardi resembled closely a 'naveta' or 'nau' of the Balearic isles. Several important nuraghi were also studied, and their structural peculiarities noted. In all the work done the presence of a trained architect was found to be of great assistance, and it is hoped that funds will permit the School to continue its work of exploration in Sardinia in other seasons.

THE IPHIGENEIA AT CARDIFF.

Two performances of the *Iphigeneia at Aulis* in the original Greek were given last month at Cardiff by the Classical Society of the University College, *The Frogs*, who had previously produced, four years ago, scenes from the comedy of Aristophanes from which they take their name. The play was presented almost entire. The acting-edition, with a verse translation by members of the Society, was published (Sherratt & Hughes, Manchester) under the editorship of Professor Norwood. For the musical setting of the Choric Odes (by the Rev. W. G. Whinfield) 'The Frogs' went outside Cardiff, and they received some valuable assistance from the Cambridge Greek Play Committee: in all other respects the production was entirely their own, and primarily and chiefly the work of student members.

Each performance drew a crowded house; and afforded fresh proof, if proof were

needed, that an ancient Greek play can still hold a mixed or modern audience, even without such accessories as attractive scenery and fascinating dances: for on this occasion the chorus were drawn up in a row at the front of the stage and the background to the bright dresses and shining armour was a plain curtain of dark green.

Outstanding features of a very successful representation were the first scene of the play between Agamemnon and his slave at

early dawn, and the great climax, in which Iphigeneia shakes off her girlish fears and nerves herself to lay down her life for her country:

'Slay me! vanquish Troy! I die not childless since
through ages down

Lives in place of home and children this my never-
dimmed renown!

Mother mine, the base barbarian to the Greek must
bend his knee

Ever. Thralls hath Nature made them! Hellas'
sons are ever free.' S.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—The Education Department has recently re-issued to the Secondary Schools its Circular on the pronunciation of Latin, and I find that it is again a reprint of the Report of the Committee of the Classical Association (*Proceedings*, Oct. 1906, p. 75-6). In most respects the scheme of the Committee is in agreement with the views of Munro, Roby, and other writers on the subject; but in one important point it differs from them in a very startling manner. I refer of course to the pronunciation of the diphthongs *ae* and *oe*. The Committee recommends that *ae* should be sounded nearly as *ai* in Isaiah (broadly pronounced), *oe* nearly as *oi* in boil, and adds the following Note:

'In recommending these sounds for *ae* and *oe* the Committee is guided mainly by practical considerations, since it has been found by experience that this pronunciation is convenient for class purposes. The Committee regards it as clear that this was the pronunciation given them in early Latin, etc.'

The word 'them' in this Note can only mean the diphthongs *ae* and *oe*, and the sentence as it stands is of course inaccurate. The inaccuracy is no doubt due to a desire for brevity, but it is none the less on that account dangerous and misleading. Indeed it is within my own knowledge that teachers of Latin have been misled by it into believing that when the Romans wrote '*aequos*' they pronounced it '*aiquos*.'

The late Mr. Munro devoted especial attention to this very point and expressed his views on it with great clearness and force. He held that Latin *ae* and *œ* should have the sound of the Italian open *e* (è), and he added that *œ* as a rule, *ae* invariably is represented by *ê*: Cèsare, sècolo, etc.

The members of the Committee would no doubt themselves admit the soundness of Mr. Munro's views, which indeed are substantially those of Mr. Roby, Mr. Lindsay and other authorities, but they have introduced their startling innovation owing to the supposed exigencies of school classes. It is on this point especially that I wish to address you. I myself was for some years a pupil and an ardent admirer of

Mr. Munro; and in 1871, having been appointed lecturer in a Colonial University, I at once introduced his pronunciation. Nor did I ever find the slightest difficulty in getting it adopted by the students, who indeed took great pleasure in it. It is true that our pronunciation was not always absolutely correct, and I dare say we sometimes pronounced *caedo* as if it were written *cedo*. But that did no harm, for fortunately we all had brains enough to distinguish the two words by the context; just as we were able to distinguish other pairs of words which are not only pronounced, but spelt the same. In the same way I dare say we sometimes gave the *ê* sound instead of the *oe* sound to *foedus*, but that also did practically no harm. I retired from my post in 1908, and my successor has since continued the use of Munro's pronunciation. Now comes the sad part of my story. During my time the Rector of the High School, from which many of our students were drawn, had also, without any difficulty, used Munro's pronunciation. But in 1908 he also retired, and was succeeded by a gentleman who insisted on introducing the *ai* and *oi* pronunciation of *ae* and *oe*, thus causing a discrepancy between the teaching of the High School and of the University.

The Committee, when they first issued their Report, guarded themselves by explaining that they were influenced by practical considerations of what was said to be feasible in schools. But as was to be expected, their Report is now printed and circulated without any such explanation; and it is, and will be, looked upon as a manifesto issued by the most competent scholars in England, declaring what was, in their view, the pronunciation of Latin in the best Classical period. This I look upon as nothing less than a calamity. The only remedy that I can suggest is this. Let the Association apply to Mr. Lindsay, with the assistance, if he requires any assistance, of Professor Strong of Liverpool, to draw up a circular stating shortly what was the pronunciation of Latin during the Augustan period, and let the Classical Schools be recommended to adopt that pronunciation as nearly as they are able.—Yours, etc., S.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

The size of Books is given in inches: 4 inches = 10 centimetres (roughly). They are unbound unless the binding is specified.

** * Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.*

Bergfeld (Hermann) *De Versu Saturnio. Dissertatio Inauguralis.* 8½" × 5½". Pp. vi + 138. Gotha, F. A. Perthes. 1909. M. 3.

Boulenger (F.) *Grégoire de Nazianze, Discours Funèbres en honneur de son frère Césaire et de Basile de Césarée: texte grec, traduction française, introduction et index. Textes et Documents pour l'étude historique du Christianisme.* 7½" × 4½". Pp. cxvi + 254. Paris, Alphonse Picard et fils. 1908. Fr. 3.

Caesar. Gaii Julii Caesaris de Bello Gallico liber I. With vocabulary; by E. S. Shuckburgh, M.A. 6½" × 4½". Pp. 84. Cambridge, University Press. 1909. Cloth back, paper boards, 9d.

Cicero. M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes pro P. Quinctio, pro Q. Roscio Comoedo, pro A. Caecina, de Lege Agraria contra rullum, pro C. Rabirio Perduellionis reo, pro L. Flacco, in L. Pisonem, pro C. Rabirio postumo. *Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit A. C. Clark. (Script. Class. Bibl. Oxon.)* 7½" × 5". Pp. xvi + 388 (?). Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1909. Paper, 2s. 6d.; cloth, 3s.

Ciris. See *Némethy*.

Colloquia Latina. Adapted from Erasmus. First Series. With vocabulary; by G. M. Edwards, M.A. 6½" × 4½". Pp. 82. Cambridge, University Press. 1909. Cloth back, paper boards, 9d.

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum editum consilio et impensis Academiae Litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis. Vol. LII. S. Aurelii Augustini opera (Sect. VII. Pars 2). Scriptorum contra Donatistas. Pars II. Contra Litteras Petilianii libri tres, Epistula ad Catholicos de secta Donatistarum, contra Cresconium libri quattuor, recensuit M. Petschenig. 9½" × 6". Pp. xvi + 602. Vindobonae, F. Tempsky. Lipsiae, G. Freytag. 1909. M. 20.

Crichton (Douglas) *The Admirable Crichton: the real character.* By Douglas Crichton, F.S.A. Scot. 7½" × 5". Pp. 64. Illustrated. London: L. Upcott Gill. 1909. 1s.

Dies (Auguste) *La definition de l'être et la nature des idées dans le sophiste de Platon. (Collection Historique des Grands Philosophes.)* 9" × 5½". Pp. viii + 140. Paris, Felix Alcan. 1909. 4 Fr.

Diogenes of Apollonia. See *Krause*.

Eitrem (S.) *Drei griechische Vasenbilder. 1. Der Auszug des Amphiarao. 2. Dionysos mit seinem*

Thiasos. 3. Opferaufzug. (Extract from 'Festschrift Dietrichson,' Kristiania, 1909.)

— *Hermes und die Toten. (Christiania Viden-skabs-Selskabs Forhandlinger for 1909. No. 5.)* 9½" × 6¼". Pp. 74. Christiania, Jacob Dybwad. 1909.

Euripides. *Iphigeneia in Aulis.* Acting Edition, with a translation into English Verse; arranged, translated and enacted by "The Frogs" Classical Society of University College, Cardiff. Edited by G. Norwood, M.A. 8½" × 6". Pp. xii + 96. Sherratt & Hughes. 1909.

Esveld (van, W. H. C.) *De Balneis Lavationibusque Graecorum.* 9½" × 6¼". Pp. viii + 272. Amersfortiae, G. T. Slothouwer. 1908.

Fitzhugh (T.) *Carmen Arvale seu Martis Verba; or the tonic laws of Latin Speech and Rhythm. Supplement to the Prolegomena to the History of Italico-Romanic Rhythm.* 9½" × 6½". Pp. 8. 1 plate. Charlottesville, Va., Anderson Brothers. 1908.

Friedländer (L.) *Roman Life and Manners, under the Early Empire, ed. 7.* Translated by L. A. Magnus. 8" × 5½". Pp. xxviii + 428. Routledge. 1909. Cloth.

Gregory Nazianzen. See *Boulenger*.

Horatius and other Stories. Adapted from Livy. With vocabulary; by G. M. Edwards, M.A. 6½" × 4½". Pp. 46. Cambridge, University Press. 1909. Cloth back, paper boards, 9d.

Jacoby (E.) *De Antiphontis Sophistae περὶ θυμολας libro. (Doctor's Dissertation.)* 9" × 5½". Pp. 70. Berlin, Reimer. 1908.

Krause (E.) *Diogenes von Apollonia, II. Theil. Mit einer Zeichnung des Verfassers. (Program.)* 10" × 8½". Pp. 16. Posen, Merzbach.

Lipscomb (H. C.) *Aspects of the Speech in the Later Roman Epic. (Doctor's Dissertation.)* 9" × 6". Pp. 50. Baltimore, J. H. Furst Company. 1909.

Martin (H.) *Notes on the Syntax of the Latin Inscriptions found in Spain. (Doctor's Dissertation.)* 9½" × 6". Pp. 50. Baltimore, J. H. Furst Company. 1909.

Monro (Charles Henry) *The Digest of Justinian. Translated by C. H. M., M.A. Vol. II.* 9½" × 6". Pp. viii + 454. Cambridge, University Press. 1909. Cloth, 12s. net.

- Moore* (Mabel) *Days in Hellas*. 8" x 5". Pp. xii + 236. With numerous illustrations and coloured frontispiece. London, William Heinemann. 1909. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Mutzbauer* (Carl) *Die Grundlagen der griechischen Tempuslehre und der Homerischen Tempusgebrauch*. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache. Band II. 9½" x 6". Pp. xiv + 324. Strassburg, Karl J. Trübner. 1909. M. 9.
- Némethy* (G.) *Ciris: Epyllion Pseudovergilianum, edidit, adnotatibus exegeticis et criticis instruxit G. N.* 8¾" x 5½". Pp. 160. Budapest, Acad. Litt. Hung. 1909. 3 cor.
- *De Ovidio Elegiae in Messaliam auctore*. 9½" x 6¼". Pp. 24. Budapest. 1909. 60 fillér.
- Oldfather* (W. A.) *Lokrika: Sagengeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. (Doctor's Dissertation.) Reprinted from *Philologus*. 9" x 6¼". Pp. 67; 410-474. Tübingen, H. Laupp, Jr. 1908.
- Ovid*. See *Némethy*.
- Pallis* (A.) *The XXII. Book of the Iliad, with critical Notes*. 8¼" x 5¼". Pp. 84. Nutt. 1909.
- Perdrizet* (P.) *La Vierge de Miséricorde: étude d'un thème iconographique*. Bibl. des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome: fasc. 101. 9" x 6¼". Pp. 260. 4 illustrations in text, 31 plates. Paris, Fontemoing. 1908. Fr. 18.
- Phaethon and other stories from Ovid*. Edited with notes and vocabulary, by G. M. Edwards, M.A. (*Pitt Press Series*.) 6¾" x 4¾". Pp. xxviii + 132. Cambridge, University Press. 1909. Cloth, 1s. 6d.
- Phoenix von Kolophon*. Texte und Untersuchungen von Dr. Gustav Adolf Gerhard. 9" x 6¼". Pp. 302, mit einer Tafel in Lichtdruck und einer Skizze. Leipzig und Berlin, B. G. Teubner. 1909. geh. M. 12; geb. in Leinwand, M. 15.
- Plato's Doctrine of Ideas*. By J. A. Stewart, M.A. 9" x 5½". Pp. 206. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1909. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Porter* (W. H.) *Pervigilium veneris, translated into English verse*. 7" x 4½". Pp. 18. Dublin, Hodges, Figgis & Co. 1909. 1s.
- Religions, Lectures on the History of*. (1) *The Religion of Early Rome*, by C. C. Martindale, S.J. (2) *The Religion of Imperial Rome*, by the same. (3) *The Religion of Ancient Greece*, by Rev. J. Huby. (4) *The Religion of the Athenian Philosophers*, by Rev. Henry Browne, S.J. (5) *The Religion of the Korân*, by Rev. E. Power, S.J. (6) *The Religion of Egypt*, by Rev. A. Mallon. (7) *The Religion of Ancient Syria*, by G. S. Hitchcock, B.A. (8) *The Religion of Mithra*, by C. C. Martindale, S.J. (9) *The Study of Religions*, by Rev. L. de Grandmaison. 7¼" x 5". London, Catholic Tracts Society. 1909. Each 32 pp., 1d.
- Schanz* (Martin) *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian*. Theil I. *Die römische Litteratur in der Zeit der Republik*. Hälfte 2. Vom Ausgang des Bundesgenossenkriegs bis zum Ende der Republik. Dritte ganz umgearbeitete und stark vermehrte Auflage. (*Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, herausgegeben von Dr. Iwan von Müller. Band VIII. Abt. 1. Hälfte 2.*) 10" x 6¾". Pp. xii + 532. München, Oskar Beck. 1909. geh. M. 10; in Halbfranz geb., M. 12.
- Schoonover* (D. T.) *A Study of Cn. Domitius Corbulo, as found in the Annals of Tacitus*. (Doctor's Dissertation.) 9½" x 6¾". Pp. viii + 56. Chicago, University Press. 1909.
- Schröder* (O.) *Vorarbeiten zur griechischen Versgeschichte*. 8" x 5¼". Pp. vi + 166. Leipzig, Teubner. 1908. M. 5.
- Stangl* (Thomas) *Pseudoasconiana. Textgestaltung und Sprache der anonymen Scholien zu Ciceros vier ersten Verrinen auf Grund der erstmals verwerteten ältesten Handschriften, untersucht von T. S.* (*Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, herausgegeben von Dr. E. Drerup, Dr. H. Grunne und Dr. J. P. Kirsch. Band II. Heft 4s. 5d.*) 9½" x 6¼". Pp. 202. Paderborn, Ferdinand Schöningh. 1909. M. 5.20.
- Tacitus*. *The Agricola*. With introduction and notes, by Duane Reed Stuart. 7" x 4½". Pp. xxviii + 112. New York, The Macmillan Co. 1909. Cloth, 2s. 6d.
- *The Annals of Tacitus. Books XI-XVI*. An English Translation, with introduction, notes and maps. By George Gilbert Ramsay. 9" x 5½". Pp. xcvi + 358. London, John Murray. 1909. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Thucydides*. *Histories, Book IV*. Edited by T. R. Mills. With a general introduction by H. Stuart Jones. 7¾" x 5". Pp. xxxvi + 88 + 158, with a map. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1909. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- University of Liverpool*. *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology*. Issued by the Liverpool Institute of Archaeology. Vol. I, No. 4. December, 1908. 10¼" x 7¼". Pp. 97-140. Plates XXXIII-LI. Liverpool, University Press. London, Archibald Constable & Co. 2s. 6d.
- Vürtheim* (I.) *Octavia Praetexta cum prolegomenis annotatione critica notis exegeticis, edidit I. V.* 9" x 6¼". Pp. 76. Lugduni Batavorum apud A. W. Sijthoff. 1909. M. 2.
- Warren* (T. Herbert) *Essays of Poets and Poetry Ancient and Modern*. 9" x 5½". Pp. viii + 328. London, John Murray. 1909. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- White* (J. W.) *The Iambic Trimeter in Menander*. Reprinted from *Classical Philology*, iv. 2. 10" x 7". Pp. 139-162. Chicago, University Press. 1909.